

GEORGIA

Ruth D. McClure, Acworth.
 Levi P. Grainger, Blackshear.
 John W. McCallum, Broxton.
 Lewis L. Wolfe, Brunswick.
 Leighton W. McPherson, Columbus.
 Osep N. Ruben, Davisboro.
 Wylie West, Decatur.
 Lawrence J. McPhaul, Doerun.
 Alvin W. Etheridge, East Point.
 Stanley L. Morgan, Fayetteville.
 Arley D. Finley, Hazlehurst.
 Charles Clements, La Fayette.
 Pearle H. Girardeau, McRae.
 B. Clayton Blanton, Thomasville.
 Roy Thrasher, Tifton.
 Cameron U. Young, Valdosta.
 Lewis R. Powell, Villa Rica.
 Aron Otis Johnson, Waycross.
 Arthur E. Horn, White Hall.
 Henry B. McCoy, Woodbury.

IOWA

John Miller, Paton.
 Lewis E. Mease, Truro.

KANSAS

Arley M. Kistler, Leon.
 Walter R. Ives, Mount Hope.
 George E. Smyser, Mulvane.
 Amos A. Belsley, Wellington.

KENTUCKY

Sara G. Friel, Ashland.
 Virginia C. Reynolds, Carlisle.
 Walter McKenzie, Eubank.
 John S. Hollan, Jackson.
 Robert L. Case, Mount Olivet.
 Ollie M. Lyon, Olive Hill.
 Fred Acker, Paducah.
 Lula Sharp, Sharpsburg.

MAINE

Marjory D. Woolley, Bridgton.
 George W. Leonard, Brunswick.
 Eddie J. Roderick, Rumford.
 Allie D. Richards, Strong.

MASSACHUSETTS

Eva Fitzpatrick, Allerton.
 Matthew D. E. Tower, Becket.
 Clarence R. Halloran, Framingham.
 Mildred D. O'Neil, Hyannis Port.
 John R. Parker, Rockland.
 Harriet A. Goggin, Seekonk.
 Mary E. Joseph, Truro.
 Charles E. Cook, Uxbridge.
 Roger W. Cahoon, Jr., West Harwich.

NEBRASKA

Glen B. Hill, Arapahoe.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 25, 1938

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious Father in Heaven, we praise Thee that Thou art the peace that dwells in the shades of night and the radiance and hope of a new day. The call of duty is with us; grant that to labor manfully and wisely may be in our sincere thoughts. By patience and courage help us to conquer hardship, and keep us full of faith in Thee and in ourselves. Thou who dost note the sparrow's fall and dost guide the fowl through the pathless sky, sustain us with calm assurance.

Help us to rest in the promise that all things work for good to them that love Thee and walk in Thy ways. Heavenly Father, let us not be in haste to consider difficult tasks as useless; let us not grow weary in well-doing. Bless us, we pray Thee, with that grace that shall enable us to deal justly and love mercy and maintain any faltering steps. In the blessed name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the Members of the House and the country to a statement that was carried in the press this morning which in my judgment perfectly typifies the knowledge and attention this administration is giving to the financial affairs of the Government? The statement was carried by the Associated Press and was supposedly given out by the Secretary of the Treasury.

He admits in his statement given out to the country a few days ago as to the amount of income taxes that would be paid on March 15 was based on minor employees of the Department going around and kicking the mail bags in the office. On the hardness of the kick depended the amount of money in the bag, and on this kind of information he gave an official statement as the Secretary of the Treasury.

Is there any wonder, when the highest financial officer of the Federal Government makes a statement of that kind, and based on that character of information, that the people of this country have no confidence or belief in any financial statement that comes from this administration?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN rose.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not object. I want to draw a distinction between the majority leader and the minority leader, and I hope the gentleman will not object. I would like to speak in the House and not in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY] asks unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY] may address the House for 10 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for the reasons I have heretofore explained, which reasons appear in the RECORD, and I have explained the situation to the gentleman from Indiana, I must object so that I will not violate a pledge I have previously made.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman completes his objection, let me tell him what I am trying to do. I realize that in the rush of the closing hours I will not get any time. I am trying to get time outside of the House and relieve you of embarrassment.

Mr. RAYBURN. I may say to the gentleman, I am certain that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] will yield the gentleman from Indiana 5 minutes during the day, or even 10 minutes.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. I do not want to be yielded time during the day. If I am yielded anything, I want the time yielded now. I have not got the time to stay here and I want some time.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman from Indiana knows I am not going to violate a pledge which I have heretofore made to this House.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Will you ask the gentleman to give me recognition immediately?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY]?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIES asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9995) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 9995, with Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY] 7 minutes.

NOTICE OF RADIO ADDRESSES ON THE 1937 DEPRESSION

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, it is the history of the closing days of the last session of every Congress that the legislative congestion brought on by the hurried consideration of partly or unfinished bills and resolutions preclude, under the rules of the House, proper time for any one certain measure.

For the want of such adequate and proper time and the opportunity to speak at length upon special subjects of legislation which I deem most vital and imperative, I have arranged a series of radio addresses to reach Members in their homes and hotels after adjournment for the day.

This does not mean that I am waiving any of my rights to speak in order on this or other legislative problems. But this is to make additional time available which otherwise I would not be afforded by reason of such overcrowded calendars, of pending bills and unfinished business.

Beginning with next Saturday, tomorrow evening, March 26, at 9 o'clock, eastern standard time, I will speak to the Members of Congress over WOL radio station, Washington, and every Saturday evening at the same time on the cause of this 1937 depression and the remedy, and I invite all Members to hear my remarks.

This first address will be directed preliminary and to the general subject, The Invention and Use of Money, and will be followed with The World Panic or Depression, and an explanation of inflation and other phases of the problem to conclusion.

This Congress was called by the people to meet the emergency of the 1929 panic, and the failure of Hoover and his Congress to restore normal, industrial conditions, and this Congress, in accepting the call, assumed the obligations and the responsibility for prosperity, and we have no right to recess or adjourn until we have fulfilled this promise to the people.

I did not come here or gain my seat on false pretenses or insincere promises which I did not expect in fact to fulfill. I propose to vindicate my obligations to remedy the cause of this depression or fail in my efforts trying for want of cooperation in Congress.

I propose to explain the cause and the precise currency operations which brought this 1937 depression, and prescribe the remedy to be applied specifying in detail the steps to be taken. I propose to tell you what to do and show you how to do it.

This administration and Congress was swept into office and power on the failure of the Hoover Congress to relieve from the 1929 depression and on the promise and pledge to the people that we would remedy the 1929 panic and restore and maintain permanent prosperity.

But we have not yet fulfilled this pledge and promise to the people. We have not only failed to relieve from the Hoover

1929 panic, but we have suffered a relapse and another depression to come upon the country to be known as the 1937 depression.

I am taking the position as a Member that with the country still suffering and in the throes of these two depressions the Hoover panic of 1929 and this relapse or depression of 1937, this Congress should remain in session until a direct remedy is provided.

But this program need not be discouraging to the tired, weary, homesick Members. Legislation can be enacted in 30 days and put in course of administration and prosperity started on the way to meet and greet you at the train, instead of the frown of another depression.

We do not need a new law to do it, nor a new board, department, or bureau, nor a single new office or official to do it, nor any new kind or different form of currency. All we have to do to restore normal conditions is to pass a congressional or legislative mandate directing the operations of existing currency facilities.

If the currency laws already enacted were invoked or resorted to today, in good-faith enforcement and administration, the remedy for this and the 1929 panic would be started in operation tomorrow to return values and the commodity price level, to restore employment and earnings and income, and the buying and consuming power of the people.

If the powers conferred by existing laws, under the authority of the Constitution, were exercised to carry out the purpose, the effect upon the country would be like magic. The doors of factory, mill, and workshop would swing open, stand ajar, the wheels of industry would start, and beginning in less than 30 days.

The Banking and Currency Committees are in a state of congestion and overcrowded with the consideration of controversial bills, many of which possess special merit, but which involve many details and complications to be worked out before being finally enacted into law, and their provisions creating new agencies requiring time for trial and practical administration.

And with the practical experience of the administration of these existing currency laws and facilities we can better consider conditions and provide more comprehensive and detailed legislation and create a public monetary system as full, complete, and safeguarded as the Postal Department or the revenue system.

Early in last year, 1937, misled by the demand to balance the Budget, which in the midst and strain of depression, when neither public nor private budgets can be balanced, the Government entered upon the policy of the suspension and relief of recovery payments, relying upon complaining private industry to take up employment where the public left off.

At this critical transition time, when new and additional money was needed to make up or take the place of the relief and recovery payments withdrawn, the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board deliberately and secretly entered upon a drastic contraction of the public currency.

On last March, a year ago, 1937, Chairman Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board prepared and published an official statement denying the charge of currency contraction. But the contraction of the currency was continued until over three billions of currency and credit were withdrawn from use and circulation.

It was these two concurrent currency movements, the withdrawal of relief and recovery payments and the contraction of currency and credit, carried on together, at the same time, that brought the fall of values and the price level and the 1937 relapse of the 1929 panic.

I have long protested and warned against this secret control of the public currency by the private Federal Reserve bankers. But all has been fruitless and in vain, and now for want of sufficient time, under the general rules of the House, I propose to continue and protest further by radio. [Applause.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Indiana was speaking about the depression we are having at the present time I wondered what he would call it. Would he call it the Roosevelt recession? It seems to me that is probably the best name he could give it. You know, the difference between a depression and a recession is that in a depression things stop and in a recession they not only stop but they go backward. We are in a recession at the present time.

I come here today to talk to you about war, war, war. This morning on the way to the House of Representatives I drove around the Tidal Basin to see the beautiful Japanese cherry blossoms. A beautiful morning like this when one can get out in God's great outdoors ought to make us all feel happy and joyous. As I looked at the beautiful cherry blossoms surrounding the Tidal Basin, there came to my mind the thought that Japan evidently planted these blossoms for the purpose of displaying its friendship toward our Nation and all the nations of the world. I also wondered how Japan could go to war with China and kill many people over there, as it is doing, and not call it a war. It is a horrible situation to my mind. Then I recalled the discussions we have had in the House of Representatives in the past year, and especially when we passed the Neutrality Act last year. At that time every Member of Congress was thinking that he himself would not, under any circumstances, permit this Nation to get into a war with anybody. After we passed the Neutrality Act the President signed it, and then he evidently stuck it in a pigeonhole some place in his office, because he has not been able to find it since he signed it for he has not put it into effect. Why? The American people want to know why. Oh, it is talk peace and prepare for war with the President.

If the President of the United States were opposed to war and wanted to be on friendly terms with all the nations of the world, it seems to me he would put the Neutrality Act into effect and stop the exportation from the United States by anyone of certain commodities that are being used for the purpose of war.

Why has he not put that act into effect in the case of the war between Japan and China and prohibited the exportation of such commodities to those two nations? If he should prohibit such exportation, and if Great Britain would take the same course, I venture the assertion that within 6 months the war in China would cease. Put in effect House Joint Resolution 574—suspend business relations during the war with China.

Why in the world do we Members of Congress come here and talk peace, peace, peace at any price, and then do the things we are doing at the present time? Building up a great war machine. Let us review the situation in which we in Congress find ourselves as a result of the occurrences of the past 3 months.

First, we passed the regular naval appropriation bill carrying \$553,000,000 for the Navy. In that bill we gave consideration to everything that will be necessary for the protection of our shores against any nation. By the appropriations in that bill we will become sufficiently strong to prohibit any nation from gaining access to our shores; because of it our annual increase in the Navy by 1941 will be an additional one hundred million. We passed that appropriation bill in the regular course, and then like a thunderbolt out of the clear sky, with no one knowing anything about it, not even the members of the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Military Affairs, the President of the United States sent to the Congress a recommendation for the expenditure of \$1,200,000,000 additional in preparation for war. Why did he not take into council the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs? Why did he not discuss this recommendation with the members of the subcommittee on naval appropriations before he presented it to the Congress? This is a matter we really should investigate. Mr. Roosevelt does things alone and to his liking, and Congress rubber stamps his actions. It is time to stop it. Members should think for themselves.

We have not only passed these two bills but we are today discussing whether we shall appropriate for the Army this year \$448,808,555, which is an increase of \$32,500,000 over

our appropriation for that purpose last year. In addition, there is a reappropriation of last year's funds in the amount of \$3,670,000 and a contract authorization of \$23,297,000. This makes a total sum of over \$2,250,000,000 for war purposes authorized or appropriated in one year—the largest amount ever to be appropriated in peacetime.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. After all the gentleman has said, all the estimates he has given the House are less than what the Budget has suggested for this year.

Mr. RICH. The Budget officer is just one officer appointed by Mr. Roosevelt. I do not have much confidence in a lot of the men Mr. Roosevelt has appointed, because he says one thing and does another. In fact, I cannot believe him any longer. Even after the estimates have been received from the Budget officer and the members of the committee have discussed the estimates it is only a few days until the President sends supplemental budgets to the Congress and asks us to hook them on to an appropriation bill. The trouble with the Budget officer, with the President of the United States, and with this Congress is that they just use no sense in appropriating the other fellow's money. They are not financially responsible. They do not know the value of a dollar. They never met a pay roll, only from the other fellow's money. They could not run a business of their own; they would bankrupt it. That is what we are doing. We are not appropriating money that belongs to us; we are appropriating money that belongs to the people of this country, the taxpayers' money. Now, what are we appropriating this money for? What are we trying to prepare for with this money?

Are these appropriations for a war of aggression? Certainly it looks like that when we make appropriations of such fabulous amounts. If they are not for a war of aggression, then why do we not pay more attention to the things that are necessary for the fortification of our shores on the Atlantic and the Pacific and build up our air forces? We can do this for about one-tenth of what we are appropriating now for these great naval vessels, and remember also that you have authorized three more \$70,000,000 vessels.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. In just a moment when I have finished this statement. You appropriated for three \$70,000,000 warships a year ago that have not been started.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DOCKWEILER and Mr. HARLAN rose.

Mr. RICH. I want to make this statement and then I will be pleased to yield to my colleague from California.

Then you have appropriated for three more battleships in the \$1,200,000,000 bill at \$70,000,000 apiece, which makes a total of six battleships.

I now yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. The gentleman just made the statement he thinks we could spend one-tenth of the amount of money provided in this bill, which is \$448,000,000, which would be about \$45,000,000, and get an army the equivalent of what the gentleman thinks we should have in this country.

Mr. RICH. No. I said one-tenth of all the money we have appropriated, which is \$2,250,000,000.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. The gentleman is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and what amount of the money does the gentleman think should be spent for the Army as a part of our national-defense equation? The gentleman is a member of the committee, like myself.

Mr. RICH. I say that we should cut down all of our appropriations, and not alone the appropriations in the bill we have before us, although we could cut that down 10 percent without affecting our national defense.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I wish the gentleman was a member of our subcommittee and could sit down and pare the bill with us, because we could not cut it down 10 percent.

Mr. RICH. Yes; I could cut it 10 percent easily. When you go into all the bureaus we have in the Government, including the Army and the Navy, you will find that every one of them can be cut down 10 percent, and they will have to be cut down or you will wreck this Nation of ours by reason of the exorbitant expenditures. You are the greatest spenders this Nation ever has known—of other people's money.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. HARLAN. A moment ago the gentleman criticized the Navy Department or the administration for failing to construct the three ships that have been ordered, and in the following sentence the gentleman criticized the administration for extravagance in having made this second authorization. Is the gentleman criticizing the administration for being too penurious in not having spent the money for the three ships that are already authorized, or for being extravagant by reason of the authorization that was just made the other day?

Mr. RICH. I say this administration is too penurious, and it is too extravagant. They ask for more than anyone should have.

Mr. HARLAN. The gentleman gets them both ways.

Mr. RICH. Yes; I can put it both ways because I have not much time for the administration we are having now. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY] made a speech just a little while ago, talking about the Roosevelt depression. When Roosevelt took hold of this administration 5 years ago we had 11,000,000 out of work, and today we have 13,500,000 out of work. You have the business of this country at a standstill. You have the people of this country worried. You have the people of this country so they do not know where they are going. You have the people of this country in the position where they do not know what stability there is in this Nation of ours.

This is a deplorable situation in which we find ourselves. Let us consider just what we may find in the country today indicating that we are liable to get into difficulties within our own borders.

I picked up the Philadelphia Inquirer this morning, and it shows a German bund camp over here in Philadelphia that had a meeting and the people tried to prohibit the assembly. In the gentleman's State of Ohio yesterday I notice the Governor is going to investigate the German camps. It is the thing to do. Why should they form here?

I may say that my grandmother lived to be 97 years of age, and when she was a girl she could not speak a word of English. She spoke German. When she died she could not speak a word of German.

Now, I have some German blood in me; but, goodness gracious! I tell you men that if old Hitler is going to try to get these German camps started in this country so that he may think he can come over here and take charge of America at the very first opportunity, I want to tell you that I have not any German blood in my veins that will keep me from being 100 percent American. I am 100 percent American, and I do not want any foreign country or any dictator from any foreign shore coming over here and trying to interfere with the progress of America or restrict American freedom. [Applause.]

We have much in our country today that is more dangerous to American liberty and American institutions than any foreign country. Let us beware of internal strife, hatred that is created by men in high places between the employee and employer, between one class of people and another. It is dangerous propaganda and should be abolished by all in public office, especially in the office of President. We should also obey the oath we have taken, the Constitution, and our laws. America for Americans, the land of freedom and opportunity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the gentleman from New Jersey for extending me time to speak

upon this occasion. I am not going to find fault with anyone except the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has the reputation of not being as responsive to the demands of the people as it should be. Although the Members of this House, because of the frequency of elections, should be alert to the demands of the people, it happens, nevertheless, that important measures are delayed and oftentimes worn out by time. In the meantime the country continues on its downward path to more "depression," more "recession," and more ruin.

One of the things that contribute to this inaction of Congress is the two-party committee system and the rules adopted to make this control effective.

No new party is recognized, no matter what happens. The Republicans and Democrats have controlled affairs since 1860, with no innovation, until these past 78 years have established a custom which no one as yet has been able to break down.

The majority party makes the majority assignments, and the other party finishes the job. Now the Democrats appoint all the chairmen and the majority of the committees, and the Republicans fill out the names of the other committeemen. Majority chairmen and the ranking member hand out the time in the House, and their power is absolute and final.

If I, as an independent or Nonpartisan League Republican, desire time or even a committee assignment, I must get that from the Republicans. If I am irregular and will not swallow whole what the orthodox Republicans hand out, I can be punished for my independence in two ways. I can be demoted on committees, which I was; and I can be denied time in general debate, which I usually am, or at most given 2 minutes or 5 minutes, but in most cases grudgingly. Thus the independent is denied time in the general debate.

Under the 5-minute rule, where anyone can be recognized who offers a pertinent motion, or moves to strike out the "last word," again the custom of the two-party system shuts out the independent. A member of the committee has preference over a member who is not. Hence, if the committee members desire to be recognized, we must wait until the 15 or 20 members have their fill, and about the time the independent thinks he is going to be recognized, the chairman in charge of the bill moves that "all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes." That leaves the independents in the House a full period of 5 minutes to be divided among some 30 or 40 Members.

That procedure bottles up the debate and a Representative who desires to express the will of his homefolks is bottled up as completely as Cervera's fleet was at Santiago.

The danger with which this committee system is surrounded is that a Member of Congress finds all his time taken on some one committee and he has no time to "think." He becomes one-sided and knows nothing about legislation unless it has come before him in his committee. He learns early to follow his committee, and not only that results, but the Members generally rely upon the committee in guiding their votes. In this way a comparatively few men in Congress direct the whole legislative program, and with the rules tuned to support the system, the opponents of committee action are prevented from effective opposition; and the proponents of any legislation, other than what a committee has approved, find they cannot even be heard on the measure.

The committee system as now organized gives special privilege an open and easy way to write legislation. They, the representatives of special privilege, do not come before Congress or any considerable number of Congressmen. All they have to do is to sell their idea to a committee. Not even that—to a majority of the committee—and when that committee votes to report the bill, custom does the rest, and Members of Congress, as they say frequently, "feel constrained to follow the recommendations of the committee." There you have it—and nothing has been done about it for 78 years—and through this system we find the following economic results squarely in front of us this moment:

We have since the Seventy-third Congress spent \$20,000,000,000 to put the Nation back on its feet: eliminate unemployment and reestablish business. That is all gone, and not one cent can ever be salvaged. The unemployment roll is bigger today than all our history and the depression has increased in dimension.

Conservative estimates based upon a superficial census indicated that 12,000,000 people were out of employment who could work and needed work. The actual figure, where all would report, would make that figure much larger. There can be no dispute about this, for it is a matter of common knowledge that a large percentage of the unemployed never reported at all.

In our excitement of the moment, influenced by British propaganda, we embark upon a huge Navy program, just at a time when the people of the country are least able to bear the burden of increased taxes. In this excitement the Committee on Naval Affairs reports, and that is enough. The Members fall in line and follow the committee and absolutely forget to "think for themselves."

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. I understand that the Senate is going to add three more superdreadnaughts to the bill.

Mr. BURDICK. It would be in line with what the Senate usually does.

During the World War we had ready for action 39 capital ships, and while the public still thinks the Navy was a master weapon in that war, the fact remains that only six of these ships saw war service and the other 33 were tied up in the protected harbors of this country, and none ever left port without first having the waters swept for mines. Yorktown, Va., harbored the most of our grand fleet, and it stayed there until the war was over.

But these facts make no difference, because members wish to "follow the committee."

We get further excited about our national defense and vote billions for protective purposes, and at the same time cut down the production of food, which wins all wars. We limit the amount of crops a farmer can raise and thereby destroy the greatest defense that any country can have. If the nations of the earth knew we had food enough to last the people of this country, and that it was available to all for 3 years, there is not a single power or combination of powers who would dare to attack such a country.

The defeat of the greatest military genius of all time, Napoleon, was due to a shortage of food; the Civil War ended because the South was starved out; Germany made peace terms because the German people were starving to death. All history demonstrates this—that food is the vital element of all conflicts. But that means nothing to this Congress—all history is forgotten—even the history of our own country and the Members "follow the committee," and vote blindly for war equipment and in the same breath limit the production of food products.

We are engaged in a great war now, yet Congress does not know it. A war against unemployment; a war against the interest system that is a cancer in the vitals of this Nation; a war against the inability of our natural trend of business to maintain itself; a war against poverty, starvation, nakedness, and for the homeless. We could well defend ourselves against the world if we would win our own battle at home.

Some are afraid and have expressed the thought that Hitler or some other dictator would take the United States. Hitler never took any nation until that nation was first ready to be taken. When Hitler ventured to annex Austria a large percentage of the Austrian people were asking to be taken, and when he did enter Austria it was a reception instead of a battle.

Unless the people of the United States desire to be taken, no one will take this country. Our best battle against Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin is to win our own battles at home and keep the ideals of our democracy before the people and make it mean justice, freedom, and equality. If we do that, none

of these dictators will have a formidable following in America. We can keep right on, however, following precedent, committees, and whatnot while our great Nation plunges further in the depths of depression until there will be a great number of people willing to be taken if they can obtain the common necessities of life.

If we mean to maintain peace, let us do two things—establish peace among our own citizens and then eliminate those agencies which are fomenting war. Let us take over now, in peacetimes, the munitions plants of the country and thus stop war propaganda. If we are serious about this, why does not Congress and the "committee" report on House bill 177, which I introduced on January 5, 15 months ago. That bill provides:

The prohibition of private manufacture of munitions of war, defining the term "munitions", and designed to prevent any war except that of self-defense in the protection of the territory of the United States and the territory over which it now exercises a protectorate adhering to the principle of the Monroe Doctrine, eliminating all possibility of war profits, and for other purposes.

If we wish to maintain on this continent a free government which guarantees to every citizen the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which was in the great charter, the Declaration of Independence, we must make some constructive moves and refuse to follow the "committee."

We should stop issuing interest-bearing bonds and call in those bonds outstanding now and pay them in currency and eliminate interest. The public and private interest payable annually in this country consumes almost one-third of our Nation's income. It consumes all that labor and all the farms can produce in 1 year. No one has arisen in Congress so far, nor will one ever rise, and explain to the people of this country why the Government's name on a bond is good while the Government's same name on a piece of currency is not good. When you have eliminated the interest racket, you have recaptured the authority which the Constitution gave Congress to coin and regulate the value of money. Cut out the interest racket and you have destroyed the private use of public money and credit which enriches the few and makes paupers out of the many.

Special privilege has always been able to control the operations of this Government because of their easy access to the "committee system." Special privilege does not respect parties. It can use the Republican Party as well as it can the Democratic Party. I used to snare gophers on the prairies of Dakota, and once set my string at a hole down which a gopher had disappeared. I waited, and no gopher appeared. I looked around and saw the same gopher come up out of another hole a few feet away. I set my string there, and the gopher came up through the first hole. Until I stopped up one hole I was unsuccessful in my quest, but after having done that I caught my game. Just so in Congress—special privilege is the gopher; and when it suits its fancy, it comes up out of a Republican hole; when conditions are more favorable, it comes out of a Democratic hole, but all the while it is the same gopher.

Let a measure come up before Congress such as abolishing the Federal Reserve System, and the private control of the Nation's credit and Democrats and Republicans will embrace each other, in open meeting, to rally to the defense of the "money power." Give the Power Trust one single opening, and it will be swarmed over with supporters, and in this swarm there is no distinction between Republicans and Democrats. Attempt to give the aged people of the United States a chance to start the circulation of money from the bottom and revive all business—out come the legions of opposition who say it is "impracticable, utopian, and impossible"; but propose to hand over a few billion dollars to the top strata, banks, railroads, and insurance companies, and the same crowd who said putting money in at the bottom was impracticable, utopian, and impossible will reverse themselves and follow the "committee" who say that the banks, railroads, and insurance companies must be aided.

I am of the opinion that unless the people will elect Members of Congress who will think for themselves, and not subserviently follow a "committee," that the future well-being

of the greatest democracy on earth is dark and gloomy. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the committee in presenting this bill feels that it has given you a bill which provides for a well-rounded program for our Army for the coming fiscal year. We have tried to take care of the more critical items with reference to matériel in this bill.

Roughly, the bill provides for an average of 12,300 officers and 162,000 enlisted men for the Regular Army. It provides a National Guard of 205,000. It provides 15-day training for approximately 27,000 Reserve officers, and 30 days' training for approximately 35,000 young men in the Citizens' Military Training Camps.

Insofar as matériel is concerned we are taking care of some of the more critical items necessary for a wartime reserve. We are equipping our antiaircraft regiments complete in the Regular Army, providing for complete equipment for 7 of the 10 National Guard antiaircraft regiments and training facilities for the other three National Guard antiaircraft regiments.

For the first time we are taking sensible steps toward a progressive and harmonious development of the personnel and matériel necessary for our national-defense system. In this connection I commend to the careful attention of the Members of the Congress and of the people of this Republic the statement made before our subcommittee by Gen. Malin Craig, the Chief of Staff. The statement he made before the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling the War Department supply bill for the fiscal year 1939 is an historic document. It will constitute a landmark in the progress and development of the national-defense policy of this Nation. Clear, concise, and complete in every detail, well reasoned and logical, it is the product of the heart and brain of one of the ablest Chiefs of Staff this country has had in all its long history. [Applause.]

I want to pay tribute to the sound common sense, the patriotism, and the ability of Gen. Malin Craig, Chief of Staff of the United States Army. [Applause.]

Due to troubled international conditions our country today is national-defense minded as never before. A most unhappy situation prevails elsewhere. It seems that the world has gone mad.

It is certain that mad-dog nations are on the loose in the world today. America has become really and truly the last bulwark of a representative democracy throughout the whole world at the present time, and democracy has her back to the wall. It is a sad commentary on human nature, but it seems to be true nevertheless, that today the world is governed by the force of might rather than by the force of right and reason. In such a situation there is no alternative for America, the last bulwark of democracy, but to prepare herself for any eventuality in order to protect democratic institutions and representative democracy. We must have a balanced national-defense system.

May I correct the statement that the gentleman from Pennsylvania inadvertently made, I am sure, on the floor of the House today when he said we are this year appropriating \$2,200,000,000 for national defense. That statement is incorrect. We are appropriating a total of \$997,000,000 for national defense this year. He charged to the actual appropriation the authorization contained in the naval bill which passed the House a short time ago of one and one-quarter billion dollars.

The Navy under our system of national defense is our first line of defense. May I call attention to one thing in connection with the Navy bill which recently passed the House. That is, we seem to have established a new policy with reference to aviation in this country. Heretofore every study which had been made by joint boards or commissions, whether Army, Navy, or civilian, showed there was an agreement implied and adhered to that the ratio between the aviation forces of the Army and Navy should be 60-40 in favor of the Army. Under the findings of the Baker board

we adopted as our national defense policy a goal of 2,320 fighting planes for the United States Army. This goal will be reached by July 1, 1940, if we continue the appropriations for aviation as we have during the past 5 years. The Navy bill recently passed by the House provided for a minimum of 3,000 fighting planes. What the Navy wants with so many planes, I do not know. It seems to me a sound policy would dictate that land-based planes should be placed under the jurisdiction and control of the War Department. Such planes could be assigned certain missions in conjunction with the fleet when operating near our coasts.

The function of the Army is to support the national policies, to protect the continental United States and its overseas possessions, including the defense of our naval bases, and to provide for and prepare the land forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war.

I am happy to advise you that our Army today is in a better state of preparedness to carry out the functions and the duties placed upon it by the Congress than ever before in the peacetime history of America. Today we have the finest and the most efficient peacetime Army in the history of the Republic.

It is better equipped and there is a higher degree of morale. The officers and enlisted personnel are thoroughly imbued with the ideals of Americanism and the spirit of service. The state of training is such as would permit the successful conclusion of any operation assigned the Army. Under the able leadership of the present Chief of Staff, we have a harmonious plan for the progressive development of personnel and matériel in meeting national emergencies.

Under present plans the first mobilization plan would provide for the immediate calling of 400,000 men in the Regular Army and the National Guard for the initial protective force. As a second step in the defense of the country, the War Department plans call for an augmentation of the initial protective force to a balanced all-purpose force of 730,000 officers and men in units throughout the country to defend our naval bases, to move to any threatened point of attack, and to protect the vital defense installations of this Nation. In addition to this force we would have 270,000 enlisted men unassigned, to be used for replacement or other needs as occasion demanded.

The final plan calls for 1,550,000 men if the emergency requires.

Let us take a look at the matériel program and see how it progresses and coordinates step by step with the necessary personnel for our national defense. For the first 400,000 men called into service we have a sufficient supply of certain items of equipment, but there is a lack in certain critical items, the cost of which would be approximately \$160,000,000 in order to completely equip this initial protective movement.

The bill we present to you today takes the initial step in the completion of the matériel program for the 400,000 men we would have available in our hour of emergency for the initial protective movement.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I notice there is very little in the bill in the way of appropriation for construction at Army posts. I have Fort Devens in my district. There is an authorization for buildings there, but I notice it does not appropriate very much money for the buildings at that post and at other posts. I realize how important it is, but it would save money if an appropriation could be made for the buildings and it would result in work being given to the unemployed also.

Mr. STARNES. May I say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts I realize and appreciate the housing needs of the Army. I wish it were possible to appropriate the money, but we feel, in view of the international situation that exists today, we should provide first for certain critical items that would be absolutely necessary for the defense of this country and its institutions. When those items are provided for I

am quite sure the conditions of which the gentlewoman from Massachusetts justly complains will be remedied.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I believe the gentleman is anxious to do that.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. As a matter of fact, the Department has filed requests for housing totaling over \$160,000,000.

Mr. STARNES. That is correct.

Mr. PACE. And those funds have been provided?

Mr. STARNES. No. We are attempting to provide in this measure for vital necessities, such as antiaircraft equipment, ammunition, jigs, and dies.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. Is there any provision in this bill for increasing the Regular Establishment of the Army?

Mr. STARNES. There is not.

Mr. SNELL. I suppose the committee gave careful consideration to the general conditions throughout the country, and even with the demand for a larger navy for defense purposes was satisfied our small Regular Army is large enough to meet the emergency at the present time.

Mr. STARNES. At the present time. I am happy the gentleman has raised the point. With the completion of our aviation program it will be necessary to have additional personnel, both officers and enlisted men, in order to man the ships and care for the material which will be available. The Congress will be called upon in a short time to authorize the appointment of additional officers. There is probably a bill now pending before the House Committee on Military Affairs regarding this matter.

It will be absolutely essential to have these officers in order to keep the ships in the air. We will need at least 3,000 additional enlisted men in connection with the aviation program and 3,000 additional men for manning the entire aircraft defenses in the Regular Army.

Mr. SNELL. Those are all for the Regular Army?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. When the additional air forces are in existence will they add to the forces of the Army or take the place of some other branch of the service today?

Mr. STARNES. Does the gentleman mean the additions to our Naval Establishment?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes. If we add so many airplanes, does this simply strengthen the Army to the extent of the additional airplanes, or does it mean the additional air forces will make it feasible to dispense with some other part of the service?

Mr. STARNES. My answer would be no. The Army has its own particular needs, as has the Navy. The goal of 2,230 fighting planes, which is the minimum required for the Army, has not been reached and will not be reached prior to July 1, 1940. The point I raised in that connection awhile ago was the disproportion provided for under the Navy bill was a change in our aviation policy but it would in nowise affect the absolute minimum needs of the Army.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say the increase in the Navy would in no way relieve the Army of certain of its duties? In other words, if we increase our naval forces in order to conform with the authorization bill just passed, will not this relieve to some extent the necessity for a large standing Army?

Mr. STARNES. We have never had a large standing Army in peacetime. The number of officers and men we now have is the absolute minimum required to maintain our present establishment and to maintain the dignity of this Nation and assure the carrying out of its national policies.

I do not believe that if you quadrupled the size of the present Navy you could with wisdom reduce by a single officer or a single man the present personnel of our Regular Establishment in the land forces.

In the progressive and harmonious development of our national-defense system we find it would take at least \$1,000,000,000 to provide critical items of equipment to place in the field the balanced, all-purpose force of 730,000 men in units and 270,000 unassigned. By calling upon the war reserve and stocks on hand that are obsolete to a certain extent and certainly not as effective as more modern stocks and equipment would be, by making every sacrifice of that nature, and by calling on private industry to assist us in our program of equipping the augmented force, we could place these million men in the field with the expenditure of approximately \$440,000,000 for material.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I do not want to divert the gentleman too much from his trend of thought, but in that connection—and I ask this by reason of the gentleman's position on the Committee on Appropriations and my interest through membership on the Committee on Military Affairs—has the gentleman's committee given any thought to material in the way of supplies necessary in time of war that cannot be produced in this country, such as tin, that should be bought and stored for a time of emergency? Is any item of that character in the present bill?

Mr. STARNES. May I say to the gentleman from Georgia that before we can embark upon a program of that sort we will have to have legislation authorizing us to do so. We have discussed it within the committee and we do appreciate the necessity for such a wise provision for the national defense. We hope the House Committee on Military Affairs will soon give us the authority to proceed with such a program. I hope to touch on this matter later in my address to the House today.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. I may say there has been reported by the House Committee on Military Affairs a bill covering this situation in regard to four commodities—manganese, tin, tungsten, and chrome.

Mr. STARNES. I am happy to learn that is true. I hope the bill will be acted upon favorably and that we can make provision for the purchase and storage of certain vital elements. We have a mistaken idea in this country that we are self-sufficient.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Some of us have the mistaken idea that we are a self-sufficient Nation, but we are absolutely dependent upon other nations for certain vital supplies that are absolutely essential for equipping and maintaining our armed forces and providing for an adequate national defense, such as tin, chrome ore, tungsten, manganese, and other articles that are absolutely essential in the manufacture of the high-grade steel necessary for building battleships, providing guns for the Army and the Navy, for construction of planes, and for the storage of food and equipment for our Army.

In order to wage a war of defense successfully, we not only must have mobilization plans for personnel but must have, as we learned from bitter experience, a sound policy and wisely conceived plans to effectuate such a policy of mobilizing industry for wartime purposes. Such a policy has been established and more than 10,000 industrial firms in America have plans prepared in conjunction with the War Department for the gearing of their machinery or the transformation of their plants for supplying matériel needs of the Army in an hour of emergency.

This will enable us to wage a war of defense more quickly and effectively than we did in 1917, or as we have done in

any war in the history of the Republic. Why, it takes a year or longer, working at top speed, to build a munitions plant from the ground up and put it in operation on any appreciable scale.

It was almost a year, maybe longer, before we placed a combat division equipped for service at the front in the World War. When placed there it was not entirely equipped with American equipment. The British and the French supplied us with machine guns and automatic rifles for the Infantry. The French supplied us with light artillery and not a single American aviator fought over the lines in an American plane. They had to use planes of foreign make.

This experience shows the absolute necessity of a harmonious and proportionate balance between material and personnel in a national-defense system.

There has been a lack of policy in the construction or location of plants for the manufacture of munitions of war. We have five plants in the country today for the manufacture of munitions. Four of them are north and east of Philadelphia and the other is in the State of Illinois. They are the product of Colonial days and of the World War and they are not a part of any well-rounded policy or program of locating such plants in strategic areas, close to raw material, where they would be practically invulnerable. Their location is a condition and not the result of a policy. There is no disposition, so far as I know, on the part of anyone in the War Department or in the Congress or throughout the country to relocate or to abolish any existing plant for the manufacture of munitions in this country, but there is a vital need for the location or the construction of additional plants for the manufacture of munitions in this country in strategic areas, invulnerable to attack, close to available and abundant supplies of raw material, an adequate labor reservoir, and where transportation facilities are excellent.

In my judgment, one such plant should be located in the southeastern section of the country in what we call the Birmingham district, which covers the entire Southeast, insofar as the manufacture of munitions is concerned. Another should be located in the Great Lakes area close to the coal mines and the great steel centers of Cleveland and Detroit. Another such plant should be located somewhere in the West, preferably just east of the Rocky Mountains. Such a policy would provide vital national-defense installations in areas practically invulnerable. At the present time we have our eggs in one basket in the Northeast.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 more minutes.

The Birmingham area or district is second only in importance in our national-defense plans for ordnance production to the Pittsburgh area. The Birmingham area has a greater variety of raw materials used for national defense than any section of our country. Inexhaustible supplies of iron ore and coal lie in close juxtaposition to huge deposits of limestone. In this area are found phosphate beds and manganese. Huge plants now in operation could provide the elements needed for our Chemical Warfare Service. Here, too, is a fine labor reservoir and an excellent network of railroads and highways. With the development of the Coosa-Alabama waterway and the Tennessee under the T. V. A. we would have an all-year-round water transportation system second to none connecting us with the Ohio Valley and Great Lakes areas as well as the Gulf. The Chief of Staff directed a study be made of this area the past year at my request. It was found this area possessed the necessary requisites for a munitions plant, for the manufacture of shells and other ordnance equipment.

We must have a sufficient number of Government-owned and operated plants capable of rapid expansion to meet wartime requirements for the purpose of supplying vital and critical items of ordnance. This is essential. Private industry cannot and will not engage in the manufacture of certain materials. To do so would be highly unprofitable. Private industry cannot sell 3-inch shells, huge naval guns, large quantities of smokeless powder and of bombs to a

civilian population in this country. They have no need for such articles in their respective avocations.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I am glad the gentleman is touching on this subject, because the country is misinformed. There is practically none of the man-destroying material used in the Army that is manufactured by private corporations or by so-called profiteers. It is all manufactured in our own arsenals, even to our own small rifles, which are manufactured in our own factories.

Mr. STARNES. Yes. I have talked to some of the leading industrialists in the Southeast. They tell us frankly they are not interested in the manufacture of such articles, because there is no demand for them save by the Army. They further say the relatively small orders and requirements of the Army do not justify the expensive tooling and equipment necessary for manufacturing ordnance. The manufacture of machine guns, rifles, artillery, and other ordnance equipment calls for a high grade and quality of steel. It also calls for highly technical and expensive equipment for their production. But, Mr. Chairman, we can supply for these people for war purposes jigs and dies and certain materials that this bill provides for, so that private industry can transform their plants into wartime production within a minimum of time. May I say this in conclusion: It is a matter of vital interest to every American citizen that we provide adequate national defense. This is absolutely essential for the perpetuity of democratic ideals. Unless we are able to defend our country and its institutions it shall surely perish in the onward march of dictator nations just as other nations have perished. Do not say that it cannot happen here. Do not say that with improvements in this modern era, with high-speed planes whose cruising radius is increasing by thousands of miles, that the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans can provide for us the safety they provided in another day.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. I am curious to know whether the committee has any information on the carrying out of the provisions of the Wilcox Act of 1935, particularly in view of the last statement of the gentleman concerning the development and use of planes. I believe that the Army desires to go ahead with the Alaskan air base, but I do not believe there is any provision in this bill for that.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Chairman, there is not; and we feel it would probably be the wisest thing today to have additional specific authority to do so. That is our feeling about it.

Mr. Chairman, every American citizen, regardless of his creed, race, or color, should be interested in providing and maintaining an adequate national defense. Only by such a provision are we assured of the continuation of freedom of speech and of press and of conscience in this country. It is only by such a provision that labor and industry can work hand in hand in a proper development of the country free from unnecessary restrictions and regulations on the part of a dictatorship. I hope the day will never come in this Nation when we will listen to the siren music of idealistic, impractical pacifism to such an extent we will neglect to provide for the common defense and thus make this fair land of ours easy prey for the onward march of ruthless, cold-blooded dictators throughout the world. [Applause.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

TRENDS ARE AWAY FROM DEMOCRACY; RISING EXECUTIVE POWER; UNDUE ATTENTION INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, more attention is being given international affairs than problems at home.

More attention is being given the Navy than the Army; we are providing more overseas and aggressive weapons than weapons for necessary national defense.

The Air Service of the Navy is being emphasized and built up at the expense of the Army Air Service. This lop-sided

policy is bad, because airplanes in the Navy tend to be developed for warship defense rather than for national defense.

DEADLY PARALLELS THIS ADMINISTRATION AND PRESIDENT WILSON'S

There exist many deadly parallels between the administration today and that of Woodrow Wilson.

Then we started out with great reforms, bogged down, and muddled ourselves into the World War.

CONGRESS EVADES PRESSING PROBLEMS—MUDDLED SITUATION T. V. A.

If we of Congress are frank with ourselves, we must admit that we are evading our most pressing economic, business, and labor problems at home.

We have even abandoned the effort to obtain information on monopoly and big business, and the present depression.

Congress has evaded other matters of the greatest importance, such as the T. V. A.

Representative government has for some time demanded an investigation of T. V. A., for the purpose of giving the American people all of the information.

The present muddled and unfortunate situation of the T. V. A., the greatest of the New Deal enterprises, would not have occurred had Congress acted to investigate and study it when such resolutions were offered months ago.

NOTHING KNOWN OF UNEMPLOYMENT; NO EFFORT TO FIND OUT

Neither this Congress nor any since 1933 has had a real study or inquiry of unemployment, and literally nothing at all is being done for the unemployed except the granting of shockingly inadequate relief and W. P. A.

Billions of dollars have been appropriated by Congress for relief, without the remotest idea of how it is going to be spent.

We know nothing of unemployment and less than nothing about the basic causes; this House of Representatives, charged with the duty of raising the money, refuses to make an inquiry into the subject.

REPUBLICANS NEED NOT REJOICE—THEY HAVE NO PROGRAM

But Republicans need not rejoice—they have generally advocated nothing, or have advocated something worse. They literally have no program at all.

The Democratic Party at least has the germs of accomplishment, although these germs are now frozen stiff.

It is for the people to put on the heat.

POLITICAL ACCOMPLISHMENT PARALYZED; T. V. A. AN ANTICLIMAX

Political accomplishment, or even thought, is paralyzed. We do nothing and wait on the Executive—the apparent decision to consider T. V. A. after many months of dilly-dallying being a fair example, and also an anticlimax.

The responsibility of economic, social, and political achievement lies in the first place with Congress—not with the executive or judicial branches of our Government.

PRESIDENT DOES NOT ATTEMPT TO DOMINATE CONGRESS

For 5 years severe criticism has been leveled at the President to the effect that he is attempting to dominate Congress in all its acts. It has been clearly apparent since the beginning of the special session and throughout the regular one that the President has made no effort whatever either to guide or dominate Congress.

In fact, on many important issues, the President has pointedly refrained from asking Congress to do anything.

This is brought out in his recent attack on conditions of the South—that appeal was not to Congress, but directly to the people.

IT IS THE FAULT OF CONGRESS—NOT THE EXECUTIVE

In spite of the fact that the President has left Congress to its own devices, Congress has done nothing, and seems to be in a sort of stupor.

It is reasonable to say that Congress as a whole is trifling with democratic liberties, abandoning its own prerogatives, and causing the constant increase of Executive power through its own inaction.

This is not the fault of the Chief Executive. It is the fault of Congress.

If we asserted our representative powers, if we gave the American people definitely responsible government, either

liberal or conservative, nothing at all could stop us. And the people are anxious for us to do so, rather than follow our habit of floundering from one policy to another, and a course of inaction.

LET CONGRESS REASSUME ITS LOST PREROGATIVES

In the days of the emergency in 1933, the President made strong recommendations, which were rightfully followed by Congress. Now it appears that Congress does not know what to do, because it has not been told just exactly what to do. I hear various fellow Democrats wondering what the President thinks of this and that, and we are told mysteriously that the White House wants this or that when there is absolutely no indication of it whatsoever. We had better learn to do something for ourselves.

If the President had the courage to give leadership both for the executive branch and the legislative in a time of deep distress and emergency, certainly Congress should now have the courage and leadership to reassume its powers.

HOME SWEET HOME; PARLIAMENTARY OSTRICHES; ANYTHING MAY HAPPEN

I had prepared a paraphrase of Home, Sweet Home, and how we should stay out of foreign wars and mind our own business, but for fear that someone might think what I have said is not meant in the greatest seriousness, I have left it out.

Certainly we are not following a realistic course, but are filling our heads with mental escapes and self-satisfying dreams.

Like parliamentary ostriches, we have our heads in the sand of an idea desert.

Unless we hold up our heads and assume our representative duties, anything may happen. [Applause.]

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN].

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, we are devoting ourselves at the present time to the matter of appropriating for the War Department for the purchase of many needed materials and supplies. I direct attention of the House to a matter indirectly connected with this, and that is the matter of the disposition of part of our war materials. I refer to horses and mules that have been worn out in the service of the United States. We have a provision in section 311a of title 40 of the Code which requires that all things of value held by the Government must be sold at auction. The way this operates so far as our horses and mules are concerned is that these horses are first used by the War Department, and every bit of use that is available to the strenuous service in the War Department is taken out of them. When the War Department is through they are transferred to the other governmental departments, where a little lower degree of activity is required. When that degree of usefulness is wrung out of these animals they are then put up at auction and sold to the highest bidder, whomever he may be. The fact of the matter is that when these horses are sold at auction they are purchased very largely by junk dealers and hucksters in cities, and in their possession, through methods of starvation and cruelty and torture, these horses that have served the United States, many of them for 15 or 20 years, give up the very last spark of energy that their aching bodies have—all because the United States gets five or six or seven dollars out of their hides.

Mr. Chairman, a horse 20 years of age corresponds to a man somewhere in the neighborhood of 75 or 80, and these horses are approximately that age when they are sold on the block. Last July some of these horses were sold in Washington, spavined, lame, crippled in different ways; but they still had a day or two of work in them. They ran from 18 to 20 years of age. The United States after paying for the advertising, after getting them ready for the sale, got \$25 apiece I think for these horses. These horses were fortunate. With that evidence of cruelty on the part of this Government being blazoned forth in the papers the local humane society purchased four and put them out to pasture here so they could have a few days of peace before they died.

The advertisement, as published abroad for the sale of these properties, read:

Gray gelding, approximately aged 20, weight about 900 pounds, tender-footed and weak in joints. Fair condition, name Pewee, a mule.

Gray gelding, age 18, weight about 1,000 pounds, weak tendons causing mule to drag left leg. Fair condition. Name Dick.

A third mule, also a gray gelding, is about 18 years old, weighs 1,100, is wind broken, condition fair; name, Charlie.

No. 4 is a gray gelding, Bootlegger, age 20, weight 800, condition fair. Too fast for farm work.

No. 5 is Joe, 21; weight, 2,100 pounds; tender-footed, becomes lame when used regularly.

Sealed bids will be received until 10 a. m. Thursday, and the quintet will go to highest bidder.

I have submitted a bill, H. R. 9848, now pending before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. This bill is an amendment of the section I read just a moment ago, 311 (a) of title 40, to the extent that it gives the officials of the Government the power to either humanely destroy these animals that have been worn out in Government service or to put them out to pasture. This bill, being H. R. 9848, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, reads as follows:

A bill to require that horses and mules belonging to the United States which have become unfit for service be destroyed or put to pasture

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the first proviso in the fourth paragraph under the heading "Division of Supply" in title I of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1928 (45 Stat. 1030), horses and mules belonging to the United States which have become unfit for service shall be destroyed or put out to pasture.

The fact of the matter is that the War Department for years by some hocus-pocus has been doing this very thing with horses that have had some outstanding service record. General Pershing's horse is out at pasture now, and other horses of outstanding service records, horses for which some person has a deep affection; but the governmental departments outside of the Army apparently have not mastered the old Army game to that extent, and every other Government department sells these poor, diseased, crippled animals on the block to be tortured for the rest of their lives, in most cases.

If the United States Government, with expert care of these horses by the finest veterinarians and the best feed, can no longer make these animals render enough service to pay for their feed, what can we expect of these people into whose hands a \$20 or \$25 horse falls? They will feed him anything in the line of food, regardless of quality and as meagerly as possible, and will drive him by whip and other kinds of punishment into rendering service that his feeble, aged body is no longer able to deliver. Think of it. A horse 20 years of age corresponds in age and decrepitude to a man 75 or 80. Think of putting such a horse out to work, usually not on a farm where work is intermittent and the ground soft, but almost always to a city huckster or junk dealer to be driven incessantly, pulling heavy loads over city streets.

The horse has been mankind's friend from the days of darkest barbarism to the present time. Take the horse out of American history and you leave a very vacant spot. Paul Revere's ride and Sheridan's ride would not have taken place.

General Grant, because of his love of horses and his appreciation of their invaluable service, refused to take the horses of Confederate officers in the surrender at Appomattox because he said they would be needed for the spring plowing.

In time of war, horses are driven into danger against which they have no protection to be blinded, wounded, and killed as a sacrifice to human folly. Horses have joined in every struggle of mankind and contributed as much as any other factor to man's control over his environment and to his civilization.

It was the horse that cleared the forest and broke the sod for the early American pioneer. It was the horse that dragged the immigrant wagon through the marshes and forests and across the prairies to bring under cultivation our

western land, and furnished the first bonds that united us as a nation. It was the pony express that made our first mail service a possibility, and it was that service in the days before the telegraph that held together the eastern and western territory of this country when the whole Government was threatened with disorganization by the Civil War. And now that country, largely preserved by the faithful service of horses and mules, the most prosperous country on the globe, after having wrung 15 or more years of service from its speechless servitors, for the sake of \$5, \$10, or maybe \$15, puts them on the auction block instead of giving them the merciful .45-caliber bullet that would end their misery or, better yet, putting them out to pasture for some days of reward for the service they have rendered. Discontinuing this practice will mean nothing to our revenue. It is just an ordinary act of decency and humanity on the part of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, this may not have an appeal to some of us who possibly are not informed on the subject, but to the very extent that our people have indulged in humane activities we have made for our own advancement. Do you know that the very health laws in this country were initiated by humane activities on behalf of dumb cattle in the State of New York? In 1869 many people in New York City were keeping cows in their own barns, giving them no sunlight, no exercise. The animals, of course, soon became infected with tuberculosis. They were fed swill from the distilleries. Milk from these animals was fed to babies in New York City. The Humane Society in that city took this up, but could get no place because there was no law to protect the health of babies. They did not then know anything about bacterial. The humane organization then resorted to prosecuting the owners of these cows for cruelty to the cows for milking them while sick. Through that instrumentality New York City stopped the production and sale of that kind of disease-purveying milk. The health activity which has developed since had its start in that movement to protect cows from cruelty.

About the same time a little girl in New York was being tortured and beaten by some people who claimed to be her relatives. The police and the different service agencies tried to protect her, but there was no law.

Just as today we have citizens of eminent respectability who tell us with smug piety that it is not proper to interfere between the child and its parents and that therefore child-labor laws are not to be thought of, so we had medieval-minded citizens in New York City in 1874. It is a breed that is not easily exterminated. These same citizens blocked the efforts to rescue this defenseless child at every turn by uttering the trite philosophy that the custodian of a child should not be interfered with in managing its ward.

Finally this same anticruelty society in desperation said that every human being at any rate was basically an animal, and it prosecuted the custodian of this child for cruelty to animals. The child was brought into court, not as a human being but as an animal.

The American Humane Association was thereupon established by Elbridge T. Gerry, the father of Senator GERRY, now a Member of the United States Senate. This organization was established to extend the same protection to defenseless human beings that had been only a short time prior thereto conferred upon the animal creation in a few sections of the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Being a horse lover myself, and the gentleman's eloquent plea almost brings tears of sympathy to my eyes, and coming from Missouri, I trust the gentleman from Ohio will extend the provisions of his bill so as to give the benefits of it to that poor dumb beast of burden, the lowly jackass.

Mr. HARLAN. I have anticipated the gentleman, not to the extent of the jackass, because I do not believe Uncle

Sam has many of those animals being used for work purposes, but I have extended this bill to the Missouri mule. I have no desire to overlook any Republican voters in Missouri.

When this auction of horses occurred last summer, Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, who, when he is not animated by personal dislikes, is a very broad-minded and human individual, made these remarks in one of his newspaper accounts:

A horse at 20 is equivalent in old age to a man between 80 and 90.

All Government horses are well cared for where they serve, but what do you suppose will happen to these decrepit veterans after the auction?

On experience, what will happen to them is a few final months of cruel service in starvation. They won't bring enough to pay the expense of sale and cost of keep to date of delivery. The transaction would be much more creditable to Uncle Sam, economically and ethically, if it consisted simply of a merciful 45 bullet.

More merciful and creditable still, on a Government farm presumably with a pasture, would be to pension off such veterans, with grazing space in summer and a little experimental fodder in winter. It wouldn't be for long.

It is easy to become sentimentally mawkish about these animal affairs. The intensely practical and too frugal French would frankly slaughter these old servitors and peddle their flesh as a secondary meat ration—a procedure after all, far more merciful than the sale of faithful equine Uncle Toms to unidentified Simon Legrees down the river of starvation, abuse, and misery.

The Blue Cross, the S. P. C. A., or somebody ought to get after this.

If a private owner of a horse that had served him faithfully from 15 to 18 years sold its aching body off for a couple of dollars, to drag out its dreary life pulling a rag picker's wagon on a diet of shavings, he wouldn't be popular with the neighbors.

But its O. K. for the Federal Government. Something ought to be done about this.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is now pending before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That committee is composed of the gentleman from Missouri, JOHN J. COCHRAN, as chairman, and the following additional members: ALLARD H. GASQUE, of South Carolina; WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi; GLENN GRISWOLD, of Indiana; BEN CRAVENS, of Arkansas; JAMES L. QUINN, of Pennsylvania; JAMES A. O'LEARY, of New York; DON GINGERY, of Pennsylvania; JAMES J. LANZETTA, of New York; ELMER L. WENE, of New Jersey; WILLIAM S. JACOBSEN, of Iowa; LAURENCE F. ARNOLD, of Illinois; WILLIAM J. FITZGERALD, of Connecticut; JOHN F. HUNTER, of Ohio; LUTHER PATRICK, of Alabama; MERLIN HULL, of Wisconsin; CHARLES L. GIFFORD, of Massachusetts; CLARE E. HOFFMAN, of Michigan; BERTRAND W. GEARTHART, of California; D. LANE POWERS, of New Jersey; GEORGE J. BATES, of Massachusetts.

I am placing these names in the RECORD so that if the Members of this House desire to see a bill of this kind passed they can communicate with their friends on this committee to the end that an early hearing may be granted.

This is a bill for which no lobbyist will appear at your door offering either threats or promises. Your support of this bill will bring no promise of votes or campaign contributions. You will not even receive an expression of gratitude from the dumb animals who alone will be benefited. You will receive nothing but the self-gratification of knowing that you have at least cast one vote that will be chalked up to your credit as being a human being.

Inquiry at the Procurement Department discloses that there are very few of these horses and mules sold, probably not to exceed 100 a year, scattered all over the United States and its possessions, but that is just 100 cases of ingratitude and needless cruelty on the part of our Government. It is needless because the revenue received is but a pittance and too small for any country, especially the United States, to acquire at the expense of misery and suffering. In the words of General Johnson, "Something ought to be done about this." [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up much of the time of the Committee to give a full explanation of the bill, because on yesterday the very able chairman of this Subcommittee on Appropriations went fully and thoroughly into the

details of the bill. This being an appropriation bill, it deals largely with statistics and figures and not with policy. However, I want to direct a few remarks to some matters of policy that seem to me to be important with reference to our defense program in connection with air defense.

I realize that in order to have proper and adequate national defense it is necessary that we should have to foot a large bill. On account of the higher wage standards and living standards in the United States, our national-defense system and program cost a great deal more money than the defense programs of other nations. The United States, although one of the largest and richest nations in the world, is seventeenth in the rank of its Army among the armies of the world. I feel that the size of our Army today is not out of proportion with its task.

I am one of those who believe that the Navy is and should be our first line of defense. Last week we authorized a huge sum, which will place the Navy of the United States among the first navies of the world. While we are building an adequate Navy, we should not forget that the United States ought to have an Army in proper proportion to meet its functions on the continental shores of the United States and our foreign possessions.

One of the most popular branches of national defense is the air force. Among the nations of the world it is commonly agreed that an adequate air force is necessary and essential in a well-balanced program of defense; yet, Mr. Chairman, the Air Corps is one of the most expensive parts of our national defense.

Last year the naval air force cost about \$80,000,000, as I understand it, and this year we are appropriating for the Air Corps the sum of \$113,000,000, which is about 28 percent of the total appropriated for the Military Establishment for the year 1939. Of this about \$70,000,000 is direct and \$43,000,000 indirect.

We have provided in our program for the Air Corps of the Army to be completed by July 1940, 2,320 planes. The testimony taken before our committee shows that the expense to take care of a complement for 2,320 planes will be \$143,000,000 plus. I do not know just what the program for the Navy planes will cost, but if the cost for the 2,300 Army planes runs around \$143,000,000, and the Navy planes cost as much, you can appreciate that the program covering air defense will reach enormous proportions. I am not criticizing the air force.

It is an essential branch of our national defense, but as far as possible we should coordinate the air force of the Navy and the air force of the Army, so the equipment of this branch of our national air service may be procured as cheaply as possible, and so the two branches of the service shall not in any way duplicate each other any more than can possibly be avoided.

Last week the committee agreed to an amendment to the Vinson bill which authorized not less than 3,000 planes for the Navy. I am informed that no hearings were held on the question of whether or not this number of planes was necessary; nevertheless an amendment was adopted on the floor of the House authorizing not less than 3,000 planes. If we add the 3,000 planes built and to be built for the Navy, to the 2,320-plane program of the Army, we will have 5,320 planes. This will place us second among the nations of the world in number of planes. As I understand, Great Britain has now approximately 5,600 planes and stands first in number. Great Britain is in a different situation from the United States, because it has that far-flung, sprawling empire which spreads its length and breadth all over the world. It is necessary that Great Britain have a huge navy and a huge air force; yet when we look at the component parts of the Navy and the Army program of Great Britain we see that Great Britain with its enormous Navy, and with its colonies all over the world, has a naval air force of less than 500 planes while its Army air force consists of about 4,100 planes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

France, with an air force of approximately 2,300 planes, has only about 157 naval planes.

In this country we have adopted the policy of a ratio of about 60 to 40 for the Army and Navy airplanes. During the hearings I asked General Westover to give me the program as to authorization and the ratio between the Army and Navy planes. In his testimony on page 487 of the hearings he said it was the opinion that the relative expenditures for aviation for the national defense should be about 60 percent for the Army and 40 percent for the Navy, and that the Secretary of War approved the joint board report submitting the two programs on September 18, 1934, subject to the following qualifications:

The appropriations for the Air Service, Army and Navy, should be considered at the same time by the same congressional committee, and suitable division of the funds appropriated made by Congress, based on the requirements of each Service and for combined needs.

It is further shown that the Air Corps Act of July 1926 authorized a total of 1,800 planes for the Army. The act of June 24, 1926, authorized a total of 1,000 planes for the Navy. This is a ratio of about 18 to 10, and this ratio existed up to the passage of the Vinson-Trammell Act on March 27, 1934, which authorized the Navy to have additional planes commensurate with the size of the Navy.

General Westover further states:

There appears to be an indication of acceptance of the ratio of 18 to 10 over a period of 8 years from 1926 to 1934. This ratio is approximately 55 percent for the Army to 45 percent for the Navy and is the one in existence at the present time.

I particularly want to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that in view of the enormous cost of air defense, this Congress, in my opinion, should adopt some means of having better control of and more coordination between the two branches of the Air Service.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAVERICK. In connection with coordination, Does the gentleman see any reason the Navy should have more airplanes than the Army? Is there any sense to that?

Mr. TERRY. I am not quarreling with the Navy for having a lot of planes. I am not saying the Army should have all the planes. I do say, however, that in spite of the fact that the ratio adopted is on the basis of from 55 to 60 for the Army and from 40 to 45 for the Navy, all of a sudden last week, in the Navy bill, without any hearings and without any consideration, we entirely disrupted the proportion of planes as between the Army and Navy that has been adopted and recognized throughout the years we have been building up the air force.

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. KITCHENS. Has the gentleman's committee considered the question of whether it might be well to put all the aircraft of the United States in one division and have one head for all the aircraft service?

Mr. TERRY. We did not go into the consideration of whether there should be just one department of air defense, but I understand there is a joint board of control coordinating policies as between the Army and Navy, and it is supposed that all questions in regard to policy are to be worked out by that board. However, I do not know how well this board functions, and certainly there was no coordination in the action taken last week in arbitrarily raising the naval air force to not less than 3,000 planes.

Mr. MAVERICK. As a matter of fact, the joint board has not met for over a year.

Mr. TERRY. I do not know whether it has or not.

Mr. MAVERICK. I believe that is correct.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. The question of combining the air forces would be a question of policy to be determined by the Com-

mittee on Military Affairs and would not come under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. TERRY. It certainly would not come under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I do not know that the Committee on Military Affairs should determine that question by itself, and that is the point I want to reach now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Even though we might not have unified direction of the two air forces, would it not be helpful in the deliberations of the Congress if we could have a combined picture of our total air strength?

Mr. TERRY. I think that is correct, and in this connection, Mr. Chairman, I want to submit this proposition to the Committee:

We have a Naval Affairs Committee and we have a Committee on Military Affairs. Naturally, each of these committees looks at the problem from the standpoint of the particular branch of the service it represents.

This is human nature and perfectly natural, and to a certain extent this influence might tinge the actions of the War Department and naval subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations; and it seems to me that in order to avoid this partisanship, if I can use that term, and to put the House in position to have a proper coordinated program, we should have a new committee in this House, say, a committee on national defense, a committee that would coordinate these two branches of our national defense. Such a committee could be composed of members of the Military Affairs Committee and members of the Naval Affairs Committee, supplemented by members of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations on the Army and the Navy; and also we might have on that committee some men from the Foreign Affairs Committee, or it might be a committee composed entirely of men not connected with either the Military Affairs Committee or the Naval Affairs Committee. It seems to me it would be a good thing to have a committee on national defense so that when questions come up involving a matter in the twilight zone, if I may use that expression, as between Army and Navy functions, and especially between functions of navy aviation and army aviation, this Committee on National Defense could take up the question of policy and settle it.

Mr. Chairman, when the airplane was in its infancy and when it was first placed on battleships and cruisers, it was known as the eye of the Navy, and its only function was to go up in the air and act as an observer for the naval vessel, but with the passing of the years, the small airplane, which was used for the purpose of observation only, has become a giant in size and in importance, even to the extent of supplanting the great battleship from whose deck it formerly flew. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, in his Budget message the President called attention to the advisability of power in the Executive to veto separate items in an appropriation bill. He called upon Congress to decide whether this result should be accomplished by a constitutional amendment or by some other means. I dare say to accomplish this by a constitutional amendment would have its advantages. However, I am of the opinion that the same result can be accomplished without the necessity of a constitutional amendment.

Article I, section 1, of the Constitution provides as follows:

All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.

In construing this section, it is necessary to consider other pertinent sections as well as the general intent of the instrument as a whole. While the section provides that "all legislative power . . . shall be vested in a Congress . . ."

it is clear that the framers were referring here only to affirmative legislative power. In article I, section 7, they gave legislative power to the Executive in the following language:

Article I, section 7: Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections, to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If, after such reconsideration, two-thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of that House, it shall become a law. But in all such cases, the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the journal of each House respectively. If any bill shall not be returned by the President within 10 days—Sundays excepted—after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law, in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress, by their adjournment, prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law.

The courts have held that this provision confers upon the Executive legislative power. The legislative power of the Executive is purely negative in character, and even that power of negation is subject to being overruled by a two-thirds vote of Congress. In brief, Congress is the sole repository of affirmative legislative power—that is, the power to say what the law shall be. The Executive has only the power to say that a certain measure adopted by Congress shall or shall not be the law. However, the right and duty of the Executive to exercise this negative power as his judgment dictates is as clearly expressed in the Constitution as is the right and duty of Congress to perform its part of the legislative function. This is clearly borne out not only by the language of the Constitution but by the history of the veto power in Anglo-Saxon government.

In an early day in England the Crown possessed all the powers of legislation. The rise of the English Parliament first restricted this power of legislation to a negative power of veto, and finally abolished it altogether—the last veto being by Queen Anne in 1708. In the American Colonies the veto power had a different history. In all the Colonies the governor could veto legislation, and in all but Maryland, Rhode Island, and Connecticut the King could veto a bill, even after it had been approved by the Governor. The King used the veto power freely to prevent acts of the Colonies injurious to the mother country. This abuse of the veto was complained of in the Declaration of Independence. After the beginning of the Revolutionary War the American Colonies limited the veto power of their respective Governors. In no State but Massachusetts did the Governor have even a qualified veto over legislation, and that not until the Constitution of 1780 was adopted. Under the Articles of Confederation there was, of course, no Executive veto.

The framers of the Constitution were of course familiar with this history. They knew both the advantages and disadvantages of the Executive veto, and the subject was very carefully discussed at the Constitutional Convention. It was their general purpose to create a government consisting of three coordinate branches—legislative, executive, and judicial. In order to maintain such a government it was necessary not only to carve out the place of each branch in the whole scheme, but also to declare certain fundamental principles for keeping each in its respective sphere. The power of veto was given to the President as a check on the lawmaking powers of the Congress. The delegates evidently had in mind two main purposes: First, the protection of the executive branch from encroachment by Congress; second, the prevention of hasty and ill-advised legislation. This was well expressed by Alexander Hamilton in the following language:

It establishes a salutary check upon the legislative body, calculated to guard the community against the effects of faction, precipitancy, or of any impulse unfriendly to the public good which may happen to influence the majority of that body. (Federalist, No. 73.)

Beginning in 1820, the use of the rider, often attached to an appropriation bill, became prevalent and often reduced the Executive veto to a nullity. By rule, the House of Rep-

resentatives subsequently prohibited this practice. However, the practice of assembling appropriations in large bills containing hundreds of separate items on wholly unrelated subjects is rapidly accomplishing the same result.

Many of the States confronted with this problem have met it by constitutional provisions definitely giving the executive the power to veto a separate item of an appropriation bill. Thirty-nine States have taken such action. As opposed to this plan of protecting the integrity of the executive veto by constitutional provision, the Federal Constitution leaves the matter to the good faith of Congress. The Constitution is after all not a mere compilation of legalistic rules. It is rather the pattern of a certain philosophy of Government. It states general principles rather than detailed procedure. The fundamental object of the Constitution was to create a Government of laws as distinguished from a Government of men. It sought to accomplish this by dividing the powers of Government among three independent and coordinate branches, each one of which should be a check on the other. It is to this fundamental principle rather than to any mere declaration in the Constitution that the citizen must look for the protection of his property, his liberty, and even his life. The Constitution does little more than to create these three branches and draw the line between them. It seeks to maintain that division for all time by setting up certain checks and balances. In the last analysis, however, the preservation of that form of government is not to be sought in any mere words written on paper, but rather in the acceptance of that philosophy of government of which the words themselves are the mere evidence. Such a government can only be maintained if each independent branch thereof recognizes the rights and duties of the others and protects them as actively as it protects its own.

In the matter of legislative procedure the Constitution simply says:

Article 1, section 5: Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings.

This was intended as a broad and comprehensive grant of power and has so been recognized by all three branches of the Government. In construing the right of Congress to make rules, the Supreme Court has said in *United States v. Ballin* (144 U. S. 1):

It (the House of Representatives) may not by its rules ignore constitutional restraints or violate fundamental rights, and there should be a reasonable relation between the mode or method of proceeding established by the rule and the result which is sought to be attained. But within these limitations all matters of method are open to the determination of the House, and it is no impeachment of the rule to say that some other way would be better, more accurate, or even more just. It is no objection to the validity of a rule that a different one has been prescribed and in force for a length of time. The power to make rules is not one which once exercised is exhausted. It is a continuous power, always subject to be exercised by the House and within the limitations suggested, absolute and beyond the challenge of any other body or tribunal.

In that case, the Supreme Court called attention to the fact that the Constitution required the presence of a quorum, but set up no method of making this determination and that it was therefore within the power of the House to prescribe any method which would be reasonably certain to ascertain the fact. The right of Congress to make rules for the purpose of legislation is so broad and final that the Supreme Court accepts the complete law as it has passed Congress and been signed by the President and deposited with the Secretary of State, as the law which passed the House in accordance with their rules, and will not have recourse to the Journals of the respective Houses to prove the contrary.

Attention has been called to article I, section 7, which provides that "every bill shall be presented to the President of the United States * * *." Webster defines a bill as follows:

A form or draft of a law presented to a legislature but not yet enacted, or before it is enacted; a proposed or projected law.

The term "bill" as used in the Constitution does not have any definite or technical meaning and apparently had none

at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. It is simply a vehicle for carrying proposed law through the legislative bodies. There is no constitutional requirement that it shall be in any particular form, or that it shall contain any designated elements. It is simply a device by which the legislative will is expressed concerning suggested legislation. Neither usage nor constitutional limitation requires us to attach any technical or restricted meaning to the word "bill" which will prevent the carrying out of the real intent of the framers in adopting the Executive veto. We must, as in all construction of the Constitution, look to substance and not to mere form.

In *State v. Platt* (2 S. C., 150), in discussing the meaning of the term "bill," the Court says:

In a technical sense, the term "bill" is applicable properly to the enactment as a whole. Although the technical use of words should prevail where not inconsistent with the clear intent of the instrument, yet when such intent requires that words should be used in the larger sense, it is competent so to regard them. If we should hold that the Constitution regards the enactment as a whole, in an exclusive sense, we would be led to the inevitable conclusion that to become a law, all the substantial parts of the measure must have together passed through all the requisite stages. The consequence of this would be that alteration in a substantial part during such progress would be fatal to the whole bill.

Forced upon the opposite construction that every substantial part of a bill is to be regarded as a bill in the sense of the Constitution, we find nothing in our way but the technical import of the term "bill." It is not easy to perceive why, if any detached part of a statute is a law within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States forbidding States passing laws impairing the obligation of contracts, any part of a bill is not a bill under a clause intended to secure deliberation in the passage of legislative enactments. Such a conclusion is inevitable, if regard is had to the fixed principles governing constitutional construction. The objects had in view by a constitution in government are habitually substantial; matters of form are usually left to the legislative body, as subject to change with the progress of ideas and events. The great objects in view in framing a constitution are the division and distribution of the powers of government, the establishment of limits and boundaries beyond which they shall not be exercised, and the creation of an efficient responsibility, tending to restrain and furnish the means to correct neglect or abuse of public authority. Clauses having for their object the creation of responsibility in the exercise of political functions are, to a large extent, intended to act upon the motive, either by way of creating inducement for right action or removing the temptation or opportunity to such abusive exercises. This is in part accomplished by fixing the responsibility for all political action in some definite person, or body of persons, by securing deliberation in the performance of public acts, and by ascertaining modes of authentication and action in important cases vitally affecting the welfare of the state. It is obvious that, in construing clauses of this class, substance rather than form is to be considered. The object to be secured is to be sought for not alone in the formal expressions of the Constitution, nor yet in the technical character of the means employed to serve its ends, but in the nature of the subject intended to be acted upon through such means. In a word, the language of the Constitution in such cases is to be construed in the largest sense fairly attributable to it and that will best subserve the objects it has in view.

The independent offices appropriation bill which passed the House recently carried appropriations for 39 separate establishments with several hundred items appropriating approximately one and one-half billion dollars. Each independent office might have been the subject of separate legislation, or each item might have been presented separately. In either event the instrument before Congress would properly be called a bill. To paraphrase a famous statement, a bill is what the Congress says it is.

Article I, section 7, simply means that all legislation which has passed the Congress must, before it becomes law, be presented to the President. The intent of the Constitution is that legislation shall be a result of the meeting of the minds of the Congress and of the Executive—the former affirmatively creating the legislation, and the President exercising his right of affirming or denying.

The method by which this result is to be accomplished is left largely in the discretion of Congress. For example, a provision could be put in each appropriation bill stating definitely that for the purpose of the Executive veto each item shall be considered as a separate enactment of the Congress

and subject to a separate veto. There are, no doubt, other ways by which this result could be obtained. [Applause.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have enjoyed the work on this committee and on the subcommittee immensely. I have enjoyed not only the work but the association with men on both sides of the aisle whose duty it has been to prepare this bill and to hold hearings thereon.

The hearings on the measure cover approximately 800 pages after cutting out everything the committee thought might be superfluous. Necessarily, after spending hours and hours in the committee room the work became rather tedious. There is nothing in the bill or in the hearings that in my judgment is controversial and I would not speak on the measure were it not for the fact that there is one statement in those hearings that I believe is so outstanding that it deserves especial mention. The statement I refer to is found on page 697, of the committee hearings, and was made by Lt. Col. John P. Frey, president of the metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor.

In commenting upon this statement I do not want anything I say to be construed as impliedly or in any other way critical of any labor organization. As I sat in the committee room and listened to Colonel Frey, I was so impressed that I determined to call the attention of the House to that statement.

Colonel Frey, in commenting upon the citizens' military training camps, used the following language:

It so happens that I hold a commission as a lieutenant colonel in the Specialists' Reserve.

In no other country in the world are there trade-union officials holding as high office and having an interest, the same type of interest, in national defense.

As a result of the efforts of many of us, the American Federation of Labor officially declares itself in support of the citizens' military training camps. That does not exist in any other country. This is the only country where the War Department and the national trade-union movement have an exchange of officers, in liaison, so that there is an official contact.

In view of that fact, it is important, it seems to me, for the committee to keep in mind that when this trade-union movement officially comes before it—and I am speaking now as a trade-union officer, as a representative of all international unions of metal workers in the country—when they come before you in connection with the necessary appropriation for military training camps, serious consideration should be given to their requests.

We have contacts, as trade-union officials, which come to no other type of citizens. We know something of the activities of subversive influence in this country that others do not come in contact with in the same way.

We are constantly in contact with the influence of young men going through many of our universities, who acquire more un-American ideas by listening to some of their professors than can be eradicated from them in a lifetime.

Part of our work as trade-union officials is to build up the sane, independent knowledge of what American institutions are. I do not have to tell you, because it is well known, of our constant activity to prevent subversive influences from developing within the American trade-union movement, because that is where the damage is always done, if history gives us an accurate picture of what has been taking place in Europe during recent years.

So we come to you as trade-union officials, urging you to give an appropriation to the citizens' military training camps which will give some of our young men an opportunity of acquiring an understanding of American institutions, which probably can be acquired in no other way, and at least to that extent help us overcome these subversive influences, which everyone is familiar with, and which are so active in our country at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, I want you to know that in what I am saying I am voicing what President Green would say if he were here, because I am here partly at his request, although I would have been here anyway; but I am speaking for President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, and what he and the Federation stand for in protecting our American institutions, when I urge the committee to provide an appropriation for these camps which would give young Americans an opportunity of knowing more about the institutions of their country, and of being better prepared to come into contact with these subversive influences which have undermined the government in a good many other countries which are without that support of a trade-union movement such as we have here at the present time.

I think in view of the fact that the American Federation of Labor has officially endorsed these camps and is doing what it can in a general way to protect our institutions, that it would be exceedingly unfortunate, and it would be a great disappointment to them and to the young men who want to go to these camps to find that in our country the necessary appropriations are not being made to

give these young men a little of the training which is so necessary if we are going to have the right kind of citizenship.

Mr. Chairman, in this day and age when we hear so much about subversive influences, it is refreshing and encouraging to find statements such as I have read, coming from officials of a great labor organization. I congratulate the American Federation of Labor upon having a leadership which places Americanism upon such a high pedestal. [Applause.] I believe every American who reads this statement made by Lieutenant Colonel Frey and by Mr. William Green will agree with me in saying that so long as we have men such as these in a great labor movement, we need not worry about communism nor fascism. I thank God that the American Federation of Labor had ever had leadership such as this, whether under Samuel Gompers, William Green, or Lt. Col. John P. Frey. I thank God that we have blue-blooded, loyal, patriotic, liberty-loving Americans at the head of this great organization. God bless them. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] in regard to the Air Corps and air development. In the committee report I notice the amount recommended by the Budget and by the committee under the head of "Air Corps, Army", is a total of \$70,556,972. It was my understanding, when the naval increase bill was under consideration, that the approximate cost of one of the new superbattleships would be about \$70,000,000 and, I ask the gentleman, if my understanding is correct, then, that the total amount asked for the Army Air Corps in this bill is approximately the equivalent of the cost of one of these battleships?

Mr. TERRY. Seventy million dollars, approximately, if that is the cost of a battleship.

Mr. STARNES. More than \$70,000,000 is carried in the bill for the air force. The total amount carried in the bill for that purpose is \$102,000,000.

Mr. TERRY. The other costs of \$43,000,000 are made up of pay of the Army, radio, Signal Corps, and all other expenses of the air forces.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And it was repeatedly brought out in the debate on the new Navy bill that the \$70,000,000 battleships would cost from eighty to one hundred millions by the time they are commissioned. I merely want to add in comment that I think it is the belief of most of the people that I know that they have more confidence in the defensive ability of either the Air Corps in the Army or the air forces of the Navy than they have in the addition of one battleship, and as far as I am concerned and as most of the people in my part of the country are concerned, they would rather see the air forces extended than to see a super-cruiser built.

I am struck also by the concluding sentence in the committee report relating to the Air Corps, which reads as follows:

There is evidence in the possession of the committee that we greatly excel any power in the world in naval aviation, and that, from the standpoint of project airplanes on hand, on order, and remaining to be ordered under funds heretofore made available, both Army and Navy, we are only excelled by the British Empire.

Mr. TERRY. I understand that that is correct. At the present time, of course, our Army air force contemplates a program of 2,320 project planes to be completed by June 1940, but, of course, in the meantime the situation of the other nations may have changed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me what these new planes cost, such as were recently used in the trip to Argentina, those flying fortresses?

Mr. TERRY. I understand that Army planes of the type of the flying fortresses under the command of Col. Robert

Olds, that went to South America and made the wonderful trip back here in about 11 hours, cost about \$250,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars per plane?

Mr. TERRY. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Speaking for one, I feel if the Army will build a few more of those planes we will not need to build so many \$70,000,000 battleships. Which means more defense—one of those ships or 280 flying fortresses? I endorse the suggestion of the gentleman for some sort of a committee that will give us a picture of our combined strength in planes, Marine Corps, Army and Navy, and hope the information will be made available to the country and to the Congress. I think it would be very valuable.

Mr. TERRY. I am glad the gentleman agrees with me.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H. R. 9995, making appropriations for the Army, totals some \$447,000,000. In this session of Congress we have also had before us a bill appropriating \$553,000,000 for the maintenance of the Navy. In addition to that we had a special bill, so to speak, asking for approximately \$1,250,000,000 more for a super-Navy, totaling about \$2,250,000,000.

That amounts to a little more than \$27,200,000 per day for every day that has elapsed since the 1st of January 1938. To put it another way, it means a little more than \$1,000,000 for every hour that has elapsed since we came to Washington for this regular session of Congress.

From the report of the committee I notice that about \$124,000,000 is set apart for, or allocated to, the building of the air defense of our Nation. I doubt if there is a Member on the floor who is opposed to that. I bring no expert knowledge, information, or experience regarding the maintenance of the Army or the Navy, but I bring to this body a layman's point of view. It seems to me that this branch of our Army does mean a great deal to our national defense, and all of us should be for that part of this bill. I do not think there is any particular controversy in this body over the bill now before the House for consideration. Every Member has been receiving letters from back home. We have received letters from businessmen and corporations large and small appealing to the Members of Congress, telling what in their judgment was wrong and what ought to be done to bring about a better day. After all, the real test of whether what we are doing in this body is sound or unsound comes in the application of the laws which we pass, and I believe it is wise to listen to the people who are actually and vitally affected thereby.

I think it would be somewhat illuminating and perhaps informative to this House if we placed in the RECORD some of the complaints that are being made and suggestions offered to make conditions better. After all, no matter on which side of the aisle we sit, the first concern of every Member is what is best for our people and our Government. This should transcend all party considerations, because before we are Republicans or Democrats we are Americans; and no matter what our beliefs may be, we travel in the same direction, to make our country and our people better and happier. [Applause.]

I have received a good many letters, I would say perhaps 200, from as many different corporations and individuals. I have selected about half a dozen which I think give a cross section of opinion on how some of the laws we have passed are affecting people back home who are trying to do business under trying circumstances. For the benefit of the House I am going to quote a few of these letters. Here is one from a service station in the city of Detroit which employs 115 men. Their pay roll in 1937 was \$214,000. In taxes to the Federal Government they paid \$73,000. The amount of money they returned to their stockholders who had their money in the business was \$3,800. The gross sales of this company were \$1,570,000. I call attention to the

fact that the stockholders got about one twenty-fifth as much as the Federal Government got out of that corporation, or about 4 percent of what was made.

From another company in the city of Lansing, Mich., comes this letter. I do not know these people; they do not know me except that I am a public servant from that State. This is what they say, and I quote:

Little attention has been called to the serious effect the social-security tax is having on the small industries of the country. I believe you will agree that the small industries are a vital part of our national production and pay roll. There always has been and always will be a large percentage of these small industries that operate year after year with but a very small profit or even at a loss. Yet they provide jobs for hundreds of thousands of employees throughout every small town and city in the country.

The social-security tax has set up a continuous monthly burden on these small industries that will not only absorb what little profit they have made in the past, but will gradually eat into their working capital until they will be obliged to close their plants. As a specific example, I am citing our own business, organized 25 years ago. Each year up to 1930 we have shown an operating profit of approximately 10 percent on our capital and surplus, out of these earnings had been accumulated a surplus of \$80,000. This surplus was depleted from \$80,000 to \$17,000 during the years 1930 to 1935, a very large portion of which was paid out in salaries and wages in carrying our organization through the depression.

In 1937, notwithstanding the fact that we had the largest sales in our history, we lost 3 percent on our capital stock. Social-security and other taxes totaled 4.5 percent of our capital stock. As indicated by our first 2 months' operations, our loss for the first 6 months of 1938 will total 15 to 20 percent of our capital stock. It can readily be seen that this loss taken from our working capital will necessitate closing our plant, or refinancing, which of course would be impossible in the face of such a record.

Another industry here in our city paid out \$90,000 social-security tax last year, notwithstanding the fact that they haven't made a dollar profit since 1928, and during this time have depleted their capital and surplus about 60 percent. It is acknowledged by every manufacturer that one of the reasons that pay rolls dropped so suddenly during the present severe depression is because of this tax on pay rolls, and the employer in self-defense cuts the pay roll.

This social-security tax is a constant drain that continues whether profits are made or not, and it is my opinion that it will wipe out 40 to 50 percent of the small industries of the country unless relief is given.

This presents one of the most serious problems imposed by the social-security tax. There is no difference of opinion, as I see it, as to the objective we all desire to attain through social-security taxes; that is, security in old age when people are no longer able to maintain themselves.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Does not the gentleman think the social-security taxes form part of the cost of a business, just the same as fire-insurance premiums, interest on borrowed money, and other fixed charges that have no definite relation to the question of profit?

Mr. DONDERO. There is no question or doubt about that; and may I say to the gentleman from Illinois that I received a letter yesterday, which I am going to put in the RECORD, from a firm in the city of Detroit that was not permitted to deduct as an operating expense what they paid out in social-security taxes. That was placed over on the profit side of the ledger, and even though that company operated at a loss, it was compelled to pay an income tax, and it had to go out and borrow the money.

This letter is somewhat informative of conditions in small industry and comes from a Detroit firm I never heard of before. The letter states as follows:

But the tax collector comes along and says that the social-security and unemployment tax wasn't expense. He said that was profit. It certainly seemed to be expense as we sweat to get the money to pay it. But he took it out of our expense column and put it over into the profit column and charged us an income tax of \$266.83.

Actually this makes our net loss \$437.70 on the year's operations. I don't know what your experience in business has been, but you probably know that every nickel of expense connected with business has to be paid out of the net income of the business. Our net sales were \$73,793.66. Raw materials and labor cost ran to \$50,773.50, and the multitude of other expenses, including the pay-roll tax, wiped out all of the balance. I myself draw a salary

LXXXIII—263

of less than \$50 a week to keep down expenses so that the business could make ends meet. Now the Government says that the expenses we had weren't expenses at all; they were profit. So we had to pay income tax on our expenses.

It seems to me just as reasonable to pay income tax on the rent we pay, and the raw materials we buy, or the telephone service, as to pay income tax on the amount we paid out for labor, whether that labor be in the form of social security, or unemployment, or direct pay roll.

How in the name of common sense can the Government expect a business of our size to stand a pay-roll tax of \$2,000 and then pay an income tax on this pay-roll tax of \$266.83 and still stay in business?

We had actually a net loss for the year of \$170.87, and yet we are required to pay an income tax of \$266.83. Nearly one-fifth of my little \$50 a week may have to be returned to make up the loss. Why should a man stay in business? Why should he lose money merely to make work for others if the Government seizes all he earns so he can't draw anything for himself?

Mr. SWOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SWOPE. I may say your correspondent has probably consulted the wrong tax man because, first of all, he does not have to consult a tax man to make his 1937 return. The 1937 return is made to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Treasury Department, and if the gentleman has been informed that his social-security taxes are not expenses he has been wrongly informed and I suggest that he take the matter up with the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the suggestion is a wise one.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I sent down to the Department of Labor for some figures. I also sent over to the document room for a copy of the Wagner Labor Act. The first four lines of that act read as follows:

The denial by employers of the right of employees to organize and the refusal by employers to accept the procedure of collective bargaining lead to strikes and other forms of industrial strife and unrest.

That act was passed to bring industrial peace to our country. What it has actually done, however, has been to destroy whatever industrial peace might have existed at the time the act was passed. It was approved by the President on July 5, 1935, and has been operative during the years 1936 and 1937.

In 1936 the number of strikes in this country numbered 2,172. In 1937, a year later, the number of strikes rose to 4,650, or more than double the number of strikes the year before. That is not the saddest part of the tale, however. The distressing part is that in 1936 the strikes involved 788,000 men, who lost a total of 13,900,000 days of pay. In 1937, last year, this number rose to 1,875,000 men who were rendered idle and 28,000,000 man-days were lost to the laboring men of this country. The Department of Labor is just now closing its books, hence the 1937 figures are its best estimates.

Apparently what we intended to accomplish when we passed the act has not been done, but what has resulted is entirely the reverse. Everybody who reads the press knows that instead of industrial peace we have had industrial warfare during 1937. It is my humble judgment before a happier day comes to this country industrial warfare will have to cease. Long ago a man who sat in the Congress of the United States told his countrymen, and he was quoting from the Bible when he made the statement, "A house divided against itself cannot stand."

Today capital and labor is divided, Government and industry is divided, and even labor is divided against itself. If progress can come to a people under such conditions, then the whole philosophy of the Man who walked this earth 2,000 years ago and died on the cross, and who taught the children of men to "love thy neighbor as thyself," is all wrong.

What we need is more cooperation between the laboring man, the employer of labor, and business and industry generally before better conditions will return in this Nation.

It was refreshing and gratifying to read in the public press last night that the Senate of the United States at last has come to the conclusion that the principle of the undistributed-profits tax is wrong and should be entirely deleted from the revenue bill. On this side of the Capitol we did exempt all corporations that made \$25,000 or less profit per year. This affected the great majority of our corporations, but it did not affect the corporations which employed the majority of the men who have to work in factories for a living. To that extent it was wrong and retarded the business and industry of the country.

One more letter and I will conclude. I am going to give the name of the corporation in this instance. In the city of Lansing there is a corporation known as the Motor Wheel Corporation. Last year they paid in city taxes \$51,331.74; State taxes, \$61,995.71; State unemployment insurance, \$107,872.39; Federal taxes, \$427,144; Federal old-age taxes, \$53,633.57; and Federal unemployment taxes, \$11,452.06.

This tax represented \$237.89 for every man employed in that plant. It also represented a tax of 83 cents on every share of stock of that corporation.

What is worse, it represented 28.5 percent of the gross income of that industry. In addition, the company employees contributed \$53,000 to the Federal Government's old-age benefit fund from their 1937 pay checks.

The item continues:

People now living and not old can remember when there were no taxes to be paid the Federal Government. They said the people of America would not stand for Federal taxation. But now it is plain that America has turned over to Washington even the right to live.

I have a further item here which is some evidence of where we are going in this country when we speak of taxation. I have quoted one or two of these things before. It may be somewhat surprising and amazing to you to know that the public debt in the last 27 years has risen 3,100 percent, or more than 100 percent for every year that has elapsed in that period of time. You may be interested in knowing that the per capita debt of the Federal Government has risen from \$12.69 in 1910 to \$281.63, or an increase of 2,120 percent in 27 years. How long, Mr. Chairman, can the Federal Government travel in this direction before we arrive at the brink of bankruptcy? [Applause.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, on page 4044 of yesterday's RECORD appears a statement to which I want to call your attention. It is in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON]. I do not know how many errors appear in this statement, but I have never heard a more strenuous effort to make a mountain out of a molehill than was made then by our colleague, the gentleman from New York, in indicting the President of the United States and the Attorney General for disobedience to the Executive order of July 1936.

Included in the list on the page to which I call your attention is the State of Oregon and the gentleman mentions there are two post offices in that State in which the Executive order has not been followed. The first is Free-water, in my district. Last October a young man was appointed, on my recommendation, as acting postmaster. The examination was given as promptly as the Civil Service could give it. A name was sent to the Post Office Department and I was notified on March 5. I accepted the result without comment; yet Free-water is listed here by the gentleman from New York as one of the places where this great wrong has been done and where there has been a violation of the Executive order of our President issued in July 1936.

The second post office listed is North Bend. As to that post office I do not know the facts, but I will ascertain them. I do know of one exaggerated case of abuse in Oregon, and it is not listed and is not in my district.

I suggest each Congressman examine the list for post offices in his district. He will see that with respect to at least half of them everything has been done just as fast as

it could be done. In all the great State of Texas only 10 cases were listed. Think of it.

In the State of Michigan, which has 17 Representatives in Congress, there are only 11 postoffices to which the gentleman calls attention. This just shows to what length men will go to heap criticism upon the President.

I am not in harmony with the Executive order of July 1936. I believe postmasters should be elected by the patrons of the particular offices and Congressmen should be relieved of the duty of appointing them, but just think of the thousands of postmasters in the United States and the large number of examinations that have been held. Despite that, the gentleman from New York was able to find only 200 alleged violations.

There will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday on page 4032 an attempted answer by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] to what I said some days ago in this Well regarding Bonneville, the interest charges, and the cost of power from that public plant being constructed in the Northwest. I say it is an attempted answer. The gentleman from Vermont does not seem to grasp the real situation at all. He relies on Greenleaf for his proof against me. The gentleman states I made a mathematical error and devotes two pages and a half to a jumble of figures which I will answer in detail in a few days. I serve notice on the gentleman from Vermont as I would like to have him present, and I should also like to have present, if it were possible under the rules, the 100 or more representatives of the utilities who are in this city figuring out just this kind of amazing and misleading statements and seeking to put them in the RECORD to deceive the people in regard to the cost of electricity. I am going to make it so plain, even bringing the blackboard in here, that even a college professor or an ex-president of a college can understand.

The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] challenged my general statement that there was no rate discrimination between Boulder and Bonneville, based on interest charges and amortization payments. I still stand by my statement.

Mr. J. D. Ross, in testifying before the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations, stated, referring to a comparison between Bonneville and Boulder, 3½-percent interest and a 40-year amortization gives just the same result as 4-percent interest and a 50-year amortization. This is the same Mr. Ross whom Mr. PLUMLEY refers to as being fair.

The fundamental error in Mr. PLUMLEY's calculation is that he considered the interest base as fixed. Under amortization the principal is reduced yearly by the amount of amortization repayment. If, for example, I should borrow \$100 at 4-percent interest, and agree to repay the loan at the rate of \$5 a year, at the end of the third year the note holder cannot charge me interest on the \$100 originally borrowed, but must charge me interest on the principal balance of \$90 at 4 percent, or \$3.60, instead of \$4. Amortization is repayment or debt redemption.

Electric rates are based on average annual charges divided by the number of units sold. Before Mr. PLUMLEY can state that Bonneville rates will be discriminatory as to Boulder, he must present rate comparisons based on annual costs, which he has not done. This is not the time nor the place to hold a rate hearing. The matter is now pending before the Power Commission, and it is not proper to discuss the details in advance of a decision.

I might state for Mr. PLUMLEY's information that I offered a Bonneville bill which is in close agreement as to provisions with the bill that was passed. If Mr. PLUMLEY will read the act closely, he will find that the administrator is charged with the responsibility of fixing rates which will include the interest and amortization charges. Under the law, the Power Commission is a check on the administrator.

Yesterday's RECORD contained many interesting features, but none interested me more than the address of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in regard to unemployment. There is no question but that unemployment is the real problem before us today. I was raised near a little town in Illinois

which has in it a glass factory. Ten years ago 2,500 men were employed in that factory, but today only 500 men are employed there, doing the same work. All the steel mills of the United States are being rebuilt to operate as strip mills. In the New Republic a few weeks ago appeared the statement that when the mills complete their improvements, which will involve the expenditure of many millions of dollars, 80,000 steel employees will be out of jobs. This is the trouble of the day—adjustment to machinery. Machinery has come and it has come to stay. We cannot discard it. I, with our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, regret that we in this House have not given more time and thought to the question of unemployment and how we can plan to give people work. We have learned how to manufacture and how to transport, but how miserably we have failed to divide the rewards of human labor. This is the most urgent problem before us. I am delighted to know the other body has appointed a committee on unemployment and wish we might do the same.

I turn now to a discussion of Bonneville project.

BONNEVILLE PROJECT EXTENSION

The Bonneville Administrative Act was passed in the latter days of the first session of this Congress and was approved August 20 last. This act provides that the power plant shall be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Army engineers through the Secretary of War, and that capacity extensions shall be made under the direction of the Secretary of War as rapidly as markets are found for the surplus energy over navigation requirements. The administrator was appointed last October, and in a little over 2 months received requests for over 290,000 kilowatts of capacity. The testimony of Mr. J. D. Ross, Bonneville administrator, covering power requirements, has been given in detail before the House Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations. Pursuant to the Bonneville Act, the administrator, through the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of War, requested two additional generating units. At the time the Budget was prepared the administrator had not been appointed and therefore administrative authority did not exist for including this request in the regular Budget, through the method required in the Bonneville Act, hence a supplemental budget was necessary.

BONNEVILLE CAPACITY

Two units are at present installed in the plant totaling 86,400 kilowatts. Four vacant flumes for additional units are included in the present construction. The first estimate of the Army engineers was that the ultimate installed capacity of the plant would be 432,000 kilowatts. Experience gained in the construction of the plant has demonstrated that the ultimate capacity can be at least 504,000 kilowatts. Under present river conditions only about two-thirds of the installed capacity will be prime power or power available 24 hours per day 365 days per year. With the completion of Coulee the river flow will be regulated and the proportional part of prime power will be greatly increased. This temporary reduction in prime power from installed capacity results from floods and backwater, with the attendant lowering of the head, and low flows during the periods of minimum river discharge.

Therefore there is 86,400 kilowatts of installed capacity or about 58,000 kilowatts of prime power to meet requests for 290,000 kilowatts. The proposed two new units will double the existing capacity but will fall short of furnishing sufficient capacity to meet immediate requirements. I have been told that it takes 2 years to complete the installation of the additional machines, hence the request at this time.

BONNEVILLE COST

Up to the last of October the actual expenditure at Bonneville was \$44,130,859.93. It is estimated that completion of the present construction about June 30 next will represent an expenditure of \$51,892,000, or, with the inclusion of interest during the construction period, \$53,188,800. At this time the best estimate for the completed work will be about \$74,200,000, or about \$1,000,000 less than the earlier esti-

mates. I understand that the cost of the two additional units, together with other necessary work, will be \$5,800,000.

REPAYMENT MANDATORY

Under the Bonneville Act it is mandatory that the rates be sufficient to repay to the Federal Government all its investment in power facilities over a reasonable period, with interest. The administrator, after conferring with the President at Hyde Park, announced that the interest rate would be 3½ percent and the amortization period 40 years. These values would be used in setting the rate base. It is good business for the Government to install capacity sufficient to meet the market and to accelerate the return to the Federal Treasury. It is the humane thing to extend the benefits of the project as widely as possible, which the act requires. Potential consumers should not be turned away. We should not force an uneconomic situation by denying appropriations for sufficient capacity. We hear a great deal about duplicating facilities. No wise person wants to duplicate facilities. With an existing demand without capacity provision we are forcing duplicate facilities which can in no sense compete with Bonneville costs. Such a procedure would contribute to the continuation of high-rate levels, which makes an economic barrier. Electricity in private hands has been the chief agency in creating unemployment, through its adaptability to automatic processes. Therefore, electricity owes a debt to society. This debt can be paid in part by providing lower costs, relieving the drudgery in the home and on the farm, and creating industrial employment. The Northwest has the raw materials. Bonneville can be the instrumentality to change these raw materials into fabricated products.

BONNEVILLE NOT DISCRIMINATORY TOWARD BOULDER

Boulder project interest rate is 4 percent, with a 50-year amortization period. Bonneville, with 3½-percent interest and 40-year repayment period, does not provide rate discrimination against Boulder Dam. Both set-ups provide equal annual repayment charges to the Federal Treasury on equal investment. During the time the Interior bill was under consideration the allegation was made that discrimination existed. This misunderstanding was corrected, and the issue was settled on the floor.

POWER MARKET

Interests adverse to the Federal power projects have made the woods ring with the statement that no market exists for Bonneville power. To sustain such an erroneous statement hypothetical calculations have been offered. These calculations do not square up with the facts.

In the first place, bona fide requests have been made to the administrator for power allotments nearly three and a half times the present installed capacity, or nearly twice the full capacity with the two additional machines installed.

Remember in this connection that until the river flow is regulated only two-thirds of the installed capacity is available for firm power. Why consider hypothetical calculations when factual evidence is available?

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION FACTS

On page 31 of the Federal Power Commission report to Congress for the year 1937 it was pointed out that the record-breaking power production in the 12 months' period ending September 30, 1937, indicates need of increasing generating capacity. It is stated in the report:

It is interesting and significant to note that, as electric rates have gone down, production and consumption have gone up. * * * It has been and is a short-sighted policy to keep electric rates as high as the traffic will bear. * * * Such false economy holds down the traffic and hurts the power industry as well as the public.

All the Federal and public and privately owned power projects now constructed or in process of construction will not be adequate to meet the demands within the next 5 years. Never again should there be such a calamitous power shortage as we experienced during the World War.

Nationally, there is an actual power shortage.

In the Pacific Northwest the same shortage exists.

HOW TO ESTIMATE MARKET

The only clue we have to the future is the past. Every bit of reliable past data we have available shows that the

following rule as to load growth is of general application. For nearly 30 years during normal times the electric use and load doubled every $5\frac{1}{2}$ to $7\frac{1}{2}$ years; so did the installed capacity. During depression this growth curve flattened out or dipped, but after the low depression point was passed the growth curve picked up the normal growth rate. Under low charges the doubling period is of shorter duration, under high rates is of larger duration. Anyone interested can prove this rule by tabulating either the consumption or the installed capacity for the entire United States, or for any or all the States in the Pacific Northwest, as given in the Federal Power Commission's National Power Survey, 1936, with late amendments thereto. I have done this, and in addition have made similar studies of load growth in Seattle, Tacoma, Eugene, Los Angeles, Winnipeg, and the Ontario system. All of this data verifies this general rule. The Army engineers in their Columbia River report (H. Doc. 103, 73d Cong., 1st sess.) made an "actuarial graph" on load growth which verifies the above rule. The way to estimate correctly future load growth is to take existing installed capacity and apply the general rule of load growth.

Hypothetical man-made estimates of demand, diversity, and load factor have no place in a reliable estimate of market. All the statements made as to lack of market are based on such erroneous calculations. The Federal Power Commission does not publish "demand" figures because of possible "tricky" interpretation. (See hearings, Interior Department, subcommittee Committee on Appropriations, 1938, p. 883.)

PRICE CONTROLS ELECTRIC USE

On July 27, 1937, during the debate on the Bonneville bill I placed before my colleagues in the House a table to prove the accuracy of the general economic law covering the relationship between price and volume. That law can be stated "cheaper the price, greater the use." I will not here repeat the experience in 14 different sections to verify this law. I will simply cite a few facts. The latest available statistics published by the Oregon Utility Commissioners shows that the average residential use in Oregon is 1,166 kilowatt-hours per meter per year, at an average cost of 3 cents per kilowatt-hour. In Winnipeg, with a rate less than one-third of the Oregon rate, the use is three and six-tenths times greater than in Oregon. This same condition will be found throughout the Ontario hydro. If we had electric rates as low as Canadian public rates it would take the full capacity of several Bonnevilles to supply the potential market.

Before the Rivers and Harbors Committee last May I demonstrated that the Pacific Northwest is not "choked with power." I stated then and repeat now that the power market is whatever you make it by low rates and proper allocation of load. There is a normal growth and an additional growth which can be secured by removing rate barriers and allowing electricity to flow to its natural outlets.

PRESENT INSTALLED CAPACITY

Mr. Ross, in his testimony before the Interior subcommittee, presented figures showing the 1936 installed generating capacity in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho. His figures are as follows:

	Kilowatt-hours
Washington	955, 014
Oregon	365, 668
Idaho	247, 708
Total	1, 568, 390

The 1937 figures of the Federal Power Commission are only 3.2 percent higher than his figures. (See p. 884, Interior hearings, 1938.)

Doubling in $5\frac{1}{2}$ to $7\frac{1}{2}$ years will show that it will take three full-capacity plants of the size of Bonneville to meet the load growth in 6 or 7 normal years. These simple facts disprove the allegation of a "choked market." I want to also ask that when any market estimate is reviewed, based on "demands," that the sponsor be asked to include the allowance for spare units and the allowance for different and divergent stream-flow conditions. This has not been done by those submitting load and market data to various Members of Congress.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I propose to speak on various subjects this afternoon, including some comments on the T. V. A. and the charges made recently by its Chairman.

Up to a few weeks ago Chairman Arthur E. Morgan was regarded by the administration as a great public servant and as the outstanding authority on flood control and water power. Since he has made the charges of dishonesty, malfeasance, and bad faith the administration seems to have changed its attitude in regard to the great services rendered by Arthur Morgan as Chairman of the T. V. A. The President of the United States, instead of referring these charges to the Congress to be investigated, decided in a most autocratic manner to investigate the charges himself. Mr. Morgan thought the President was prejudiced and refused to testify in detail.

The President proceeded and acted as judge and jury, as prosecuting attorney and as lord high executioner, and dismissed Chairman Morgan.

I submit to the Members of this House, regardless of partisanship, that this is the beginning of fascism in the United States. This is not only the beginning but this is fascism in line with what occurs in Germany, in Italy, and in Russia. It is part and parcel of the OGPU system of Soviet Russia. A one-man trial and a great public servant has his head cut off and no demand is made by the President for a thorough investigation by the Congress of the United States.

I submit that the action of President Roosevelt was high-handed, arbitrary, and ruthless, in defiance of the Congress and in violation of the laws of the land.

The Congress set up a separate agency with semilegislativ and possibly semijudicial powers. It demanded that the T. V. A. be a separate agency by itself, and it specifically wrote into the law the requirement that the Congress, by concurrent resolution, should remove any of the directors. This was written into the law in specific language. The President of the United States, however, in violation of that law, took it upon himself to remove Dr. Morgan. Unmindful of his removal of Mr. Humphrey from the Federal Trade Commission, which action was held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, the President proceeds and removes Dr. Morgan, a far worse case because of the specific limitation written into the T. V. A. Act by the Congress. That is why I purposely and deliberately state that this autocratic and high-handed act of the President is an act of fascism.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. LEAVY. The gentleman stated that the T. V. A. was set up with delegated legislative authority and with judicial authority. I am not intending to challenge the gentleman's statement, but I think he should state what judicial authority, quasi or otherwise, T. V. A. has.

Mr. FISH. The purpose of the T. V. A. and the very reason for establishing it as a separate agency was because Congress at that time knew that this separate agency must have very large policy-making powers.

Mr. LEAVY. But the gentleman does not contend that policy-making powers are judicial at all?

Mr. FISH. They are mostly legislative. Whether there are some judicial powers or not, I am rather inclined to think they exercise certain semijudicial authority along with the legislative powers, as they have almost complete policy-making powers. Whether those policy-making powers actually give the T. V. A. Commission some semijudicial authority also is a matter of record; I will not insist or quibble about it.

Mr. LEAVY. Would it not be more nearly the fact to state that the authority of T. V. A. may be a delegated legislative power, but finally is an executive function.

Mr. FISH. Not at all. That is why we set the T. V. A. up as a special agency. That is why the Congress limited the control of the President over it, so that he would not have the usual and unlimited executive function. Congress wrote the restriction deliberately into the law. This is an exception to most legislation; and I think the gentleman, if he will

read the speeches of Senator NORRIS, will find it exactly what Congress proposed to do.

Senator NORRIS was the author and main sponsor of the T. V. A. He proposed that the President should have restricted and limited powers over it, that it should be the pet child of the Congress, that we should have almost complete control, and for that reason we delegated very large legislative powers to the T. V. A. in order that it might make these policies without coming back to the Congress or be interfered with by the President. Senator NORRIS pointed out at the time that the T. V. A. was expected to be a permanent agency of the Government and he did not want a President, who might be unfriendly, to have the power to destroy the will of the Congress.

Mr. FRED M. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. FRED M. VINSON. Prior to the time that Chairman Morgan came under fire, in statements that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has made upon this floor and elsewhere in regard to the T. V. A., what has been the attitude of the gentleman from New York with reference to the efficiency and resultant effect of the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. FISH. I am not an authority upon the T. V. A. and its accomplishments.

Mr. FRED M. VINSON. Has not the gentleman been critical of it?

Mr. FISH. I suppose less than almost any one on this side of the House. I do not know that I have ever spoken in opposition to T. V. A. I am not for the principle involved of Government ownership and competition with private enterprise but because it became the law of the land I had hoped, for one, that it would work out satisfactorily and sometimes I would vote for the appropriations asked for it and other times I would not. For instance, I did not vote appropriations for the dam in the gentleman's own State of Kentucky. I voted against it. After all, what I want is an impartial investigation by Congress, and that no guilty man shall escape.

Mr. FRED M. VINSON. Could the gentleman tell me of one kind word that he ever said about the Tennessee Valley Authority or Chairman Morgan prior to the time of Chairman Morgan's present involvement?

Mr. FISH. In answer to the gentleman, can the gentleman tell me one critical word that I have ever said against T. V. A.? In the first place, the T. V. A. is not in my section of the country; in the second place, I knew very little about its administration; and, in the third place, I was opposed to it in principle, but, it having become the law of the land, I wished it well and hoped it would succeed; but now there is only one possible thing to do, and that is to investigate it from beginning to end and investigate these serious charges of dishonesty and malfeasance and bad faith made by the Chairman of the T. V. A. The gentleman from Kentucky certainly goes along that far, does he not?

Mr. FRED M. VINSON. I certainly would not agree with anyone being dishonest or inefficient or having bad faith.

Mr. FISH. Chairman Arthur Morgan was known to Congress and to most of the country as the greatest authority on water power and flood control. He makes specific charges of dishonesty and malfeasance relating to the administration of the T. V. A.

Mr. FRED M. VINSON. And refuses to say one word in substantiation of those charges.

Mr. FISH. But is willing to, and always has said that he is willing to, testify before an investigating committee of the Congress. He claims that the President of the United States has not the right or the authority to conduct such an investigation. In the second place, he claims that such an investigation would be prejudiced, and therefore, as a courageous and independent man, respecting his own dignity, he refused to testify.

Mr. FRED M. VINSON. It just seems to me that gentlemen who are critical of the President of the United States

in the present situation can only be actuated by partisan motives. For years, since the appointment of Chairman Morgan, the gentleman and his party have been critical of the T. V. A. administration, charging it with everything under the sun.

Mr. FISH. In competition with private business.

Mr. FRED M. VINSON. And now when the President of the United States seeks to remove an obstacle to efficiency and proper administration, immediately overnight Chairman Morgan becomes a great administrator and the President, of course, is wrong.

Mr. FISH. Oh, no. For all I know he has been a great administrator, but that is not the question. He was appointed by the President because of his knowledge and experience and has always been regarded as an honest and honorable man.

I believe he is an honest man. He certainly did not turn into a dishonest public servant overnight. If he be an honest administrator, then it is the duty of Congress to investigate these charges of dishonesty, yet no effort has been made by Congress until very recently to do anything at all. I believe Congress has been trying to whitewash the charges if it could. It is now being forced by public opinion to investigate, but it has been very slow in coming forward to investigate, and has been making haste very slowly indeed. All Mr. Morgan wants is to have the charges investigated by Congress. I cannot prove his charges and the gentleman cannot disprove them. He is entitled to be heard without any further delay or obstacles being put in the way of a thorough investigation.

Mr. FRED M. VINSON. I know the gentleman from New York sufficiently to say that if he had proof to substantiate those charges and the President of the United States asked him to do so, that he would have had the courage to have spoken.

Mr. FISH. I think there is one thing about Mr. Morgan that no one can deny, and that is he is highly courageous. No man in public life recently has demonstrated the high degree of courage shown by Dr. Morgan. He went before the President and practically told him that he refused to testify because the President had no authority, but that he was ready and willing to present the facts before the only body that had authority to consider the charges, the Congress of the United States. That is all he said. That was a courageous act. Will anybody deny it? As far as I am concerned, I would like to see a vote of thanks adopted by the Congress for the great ability, purity, fidelity, firmness, and courage with which Chairman Morgan has discharged his public services. I think the Congress could well afford to pass a resolution of that kind instead of questioning his courage.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does not the gentleman think it is a little premature to do that? Had we not better wait to see whether this man can prove charges of dishonesty and malfeasance against his colleagues before we exonerate him? [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. I may say to the majority leader that I am not trying to exonerate him. I merely stated that I believed he was an honest and upright public official. On the other hand, why all this delay about creating your committee? Why did you not act when these charges were made in regard to the administration of the T. V. A. created by the Congress? That is why it might be necessary to offer a resolution such as I suggested. I submit that no one has the right to rise on the floor of this House and attempt either to prove or to disprove the charges made by Mr. Arthur Morgan in his capacity as Chairman of the T. V. A. I am not trying to do either. I am simply pointing out that these serious charges have been made and that Mr. Morgan has been arbitrarily dismissed by the President, in my opinion, in defiance of Congress, in violation of law; and the one thing that the Congress should do without any further delay is to give him an immediate hearing before an impartial committee of the Senate and the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. I may say in reply to the gentleman that that opportunity is going to be offered to Mr. Morgan at a very early date.

Mr. FISH. That is all Mr. Morgan asked for. That, however, does not change one iota the opinion of those of us not only in the House but throughout the country who believed and still believe that the President acted in an arbitrary fashion and in an unconstitutional manner. This can be settled only by the courts of the United States, not by the Congress. The courts held against the President in the Humphreys case and, by analogy, will hold against the President in this case.

Mr. McREYNOLDS and Mr. HARLAN rose.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield first to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS].

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that these charges were made to the President in complaint against the other two Members when they were having this dispute? Is the gentleman aware of that fact?

Mr. FISH. I know the President had these alleged hearings, and I know what was said at those hearings.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Does the gentleman know what led up to that? Does the gentleman know that during the time this disturbance had been going on Chairman Morgan had been talking to the President making these charges? Under those circumstances does the gentleman think the President had no authority or that it was not his duty to call them in and have the charges substantiated by one side or the other?

Mr. FISH. I agree with the gentleman that it was the right of the President to call in all the Commissioners, all three, and hear any statements they wanted to make. If he did determine that Chairman Morgan was in error and was wrong, then the immediate and proper procedure should have been for him to send a message to the Congress asking the Congress in accordance with law to remove the Chairman on the basis of the facts that he himself had discovered. The Congress would have acted immediately and everything would have been in accordance with the law and the President would not be subjected to any criticism. Instead of that he did not wait 24 hours to remove him in a most arbitrary and high-handed manner and probably illegal.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. How could the President get the facts when Dr. Morgan refused to tell him?

Mr. FISH. The President made certain statements about Mr. Morgan. He made the definite statement that Mr. Morgan had made libelous references. How did the President know Mr. Morgan had made libelous statements? The President sent a message to Congress definitely stating that Mr. Morgan made libelous statements. If no facts were presented at the hearing the President had no right to make such a statement, but he did make it. He could have sent a message to the Congress, including such a charge, and asked for Mr. Morgan's removal, which he did not do.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Did he not have a right to make that statement after Mr. Morgan refused to furnish any other facts and the other members refuted those statements?

Mr. FISH. I do not know that he had any such right at all. It was a one-sided hearing, and Chairman Morgan stood on his rights, denied the President's authority, and claimed he was prejudiced.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. There were two sides offered to Mr. Morgan.

Mr. FISH. It was a prejudiced hearing. There is also a question as to the legality of the entire hearing. This was challenged by Mr. Morgan and it was his right to challenge it.

Mr. STARNES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES. Does the gentleman from New York think that the Congress should vote an investigation without some substantiating evidence of the charges made?

Mr. FISH. When a high public official, an appointee of the President of the United States, the head of an agency

created, set up, and established by the Congress of the United States, makes charges of that nature there ought to be an investigation immediately.

Mr. STARNES. Regardless of whether or not there are any facts produced to substantiate the charge?

Mr. FISH. An investigation may be made in two ways. Now, we have to do it by a special investigating committee created by Congress because this matter has become of great public interest and therefore that is the only possible way to proceed. When he first made the charges we could very well have called Mr. Morgan before the committee that deals with the T. V. A. in this House and stated to him, "Mr. Morgan, you made certain charges of dishonesty, malfeasance, bad faith, and so forth. We want to know the facts." Then we could decide whether to proceed to investigate, and that is what should have been done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Does the gentleman recall that between the time the charges were made and the investigation was first held in the Teapot Dome matter 9 months elapsed?

Mr. FISH. May I say to the gentleman he was not in the House at that time, but there were those on this side of the House who demanded an investigation, and I know that, because I happened to have been one of those Members. I remember using exactly the same words in the Teapot Dome case I am using now, that no guilty man shall escape. Dishonesty and malfeasance in office should not be a partisan issue.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Where did the principal opposition come from at that time?

Mr. FISH. They were investigated. The investigation was conducted in a nonpartisan way and some of those men went to jail.

Mr. O'TOOLE. The principal opposition to that investigation came from the Republican side of the House.

Mr. FISH. The answer to that, and the fact is, they were investigated and several of those men were sent to jail and the investigation was fearless and thorough, and that is exactly what the American people want and expect now in the T. V. A. case.

Mr. O'TOOLE. The true answer is that the shoe is on the other foot.

Mr. FISH. Not at all. I do not see where there should be any partisanship in a question of this kind. This involves a great agency created by the Congress. There should be no delay. This investigation should be adopted unanimously and it should be welcomed by every Democrat.

I believe the honesty of the Democrats is on a par and equal to the honesty of the Republicans. I know the Members of this House will not stand for dishonesty in this administration or any other administration regardless of party affiliations. They do not propose by their votes to cover up dishonesty. Not a single man in this House wants to do that. So, I say, let us proceed to investigate and have a thorough, fearless, and impartial investigation, no matter who it hurts, no matter who it hits, and let us clean up the whole rotten mess.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I ask the gentleman what charges he thinks ought to be investigated?

Mr. FISH. I may say to the gentleman I think every single charge made by the Chairman of this great governmental agency on his own authority as Chairman of the T. V. A., every single charge he makes in regard to the administration of the T. V. A., the officials of the T. V. A. and his colleagues should be investigated to the very bottom and after we get the truth it is then our duty to act. If there is no truth to the charges, and they cannot be substantiated then it is our duty to say so and clear the T. V. A.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would the gentleman include in that investigation the charges that the other two members of the board may have made as to the tactics used in obstructing the work of the T. V. A., either by any member of the board or by private utilities?

Mr. FISH. I think it is a mistake to bring in the private utilities. I am not averse to having a separate investigation of the private utilities at any time by this House. I would welcome such an investigation, but I do not think it has any bearing upon an investigation of the charges of Mr. Morgan. That is all that should be investigated. It should include the charges of any other official against Mr. Morgan or by his colleagues, but it ought to be confined to those charges and countercharges; otherwise the public utilities will be used as a red herring and we will get nowhere. The result will be a complete whitewash.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CULKIN. Would the gentleman include in the investigation the charge of Chairman Morgan that Mr. Lillenthal and the other Morgan connived in the payment of \$5,000,000 to a Member of the other body? Would he include that in the investigation?

Mr. FISH. Certainly. I would include an investigation of every charge made, and particularly such a serious charge.

Mr. CULKIN. Is that not a grievous charge? Is it not sufficient to base an investigation on, and of such importance as to demand an investigation?

Mr. FISH. The very charge of dishonesty alone is sufficient. These charges have been made public, and we cannot cover up on any of them or even attempt to if we are to maintain our self-respect and our position as representatives of the people.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. The question has been brought up about the Republican attitude toward an investigation of Teapot Dome. If the gentleman remembers, when that was brought to the attention of Calvin Coolidge, who was then President of the United States, he did not wait. He said:

Let us have a clean-cut investigation. Give me two investigators. You can give me one Republican and one Democrat. The only thing we want to know are the facts in the case.

That is my position in regard to this present investigation. Let us just get the facts in the case.

Mr. FISH. I agree with both my colleagues from New York. These are serious charges. We ought to prove or disprove them. To do so we must have an immediate investigation by Congress to get the facts.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In view of the amount of Federal funds expended on this great project and in view of these charges and countercharges, does the gentleman believe the American public is going to take anything except a fair and complete investigation at this time?

Mr. FISH. I agree with the gentleman just 100 percent. We ask for nothing more and we will take nothing less.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. The investigation must be thorough, detailed, honest, nonpartisan, and unprejudiced. All the facts must be brought out and nothing covered up. Why should we go into an investigation of the public utilities, which might take years to complete, and drag that red herring across the trail? Let us specify in our resolution precisely that we shall investigate these charges and the T. V. A., and nothing else.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Of course, the gentleman knows the Senate has already passed a joint resolution for an investigation.

Mr. FISH. Yes; and I know of the statement made by the gentleman.

Mr. RAYBURN. I am sure the gentleman understood before he began his remarks that such a resolution had been passed.

Mr. SNELL. Was the resolution passed this afternoon?

Mr. RAYBURN. It was passed this afternoon. The gentleman also knows he has been given every assurance by the Speaker of the House and by myself, with the minority leader joining with us, that we want an investigation. Does the gentleman have any idea the Vice President of the United States, after consulting with the majority leader of the Senate and with the minority leader [Mr. McNARY], and the Speaker of this House, after consulting, as I am sure he will, with the minority leader, would appoint a committee that would throw mud on anybody or would whitewash anybody, or would do anything but have a complete and full investigation?

Mr. FISH. I may say to the gentleman I do not have any such idea. Furthermore, may I commend the majority leader for making the public statement yesterday or the day before that the House insisted on participating in the investigation and that it would not stand merely for a Senatorial investigation. In that statement the gentleman has the backing of the entire public, without regard to partisanship. Of course, the House should participate equally with the Senate. I believe if the gentleman had not made that statement when he did there might have been two separate investigations, which would have been a farce. If we have a joint House and Senate investigation, we do not look for any whitewash. The minority members of the investigating committee will certainly not stand for any whitewash, and I do not believe the majority members intend from now on to try to cover up any of the facts. However, this does not change what the President has done and does not undo his arbitrary, high-handed act of removing Dr. Morgan. Where are our three separate and independent branches of Government when the President takes it upon himself in defiance of the Congress to throw out a high official of the Government who is protected by an act of Congress which is still the law of the land?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Can the gentleman from New York tell the Members of this body whenever before in the history of our Republic the President of the United States has acted as a judicial tribunal to try such a case or has tried to assume the functions of the legislative branch of our Government by holding a one-man investigation?

Mr. FISH. In my opinion, this is a complete usurpation of the powers of the Congress. This is a much worse case than the violation of the Tenure of Office Act by President Andrew Johnson, who was almost impeached because he violated that act and removed Edwin Stanton, Secretary of War, from office without the consent of the Senate.

Mr. SHORT. What purpose could the President of the United States have in holding an investigation himself other than to smother a smoldering scandal?

Mr. RAYBURN. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is going just a little too far. That charges a President of the United States with trying to suppress a scandal, despite the fact that everything that occurred in the hearings, every question that was asked and every answer that was given, was made public and sent to the House of Representatives. There are certain limits. It matters not how much anybody may hate Franklin D. Roosevelt, he is the President of the United States and its 130,000,000 people. I am utterly surprised that any Member of the House would make a statement like that made by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri for the purpose of answering the majority leader.

Mr. SHORT. There are just two ways in which any member of the board can be discharged. The first is by concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives and the Senate, because the T. V. A. is a creature of the Congress.

The only reason or the only just cause for which the President of the United States can remove a member of the board is because a member of the board has appointed employees for political reasons and without any regard to merit, and certainly Dr. Morgan has never been charged even by the President of the United States himself with the commission of that misdemeanor.

Mr. FISH. I yielded to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] because the gentleman from Missouri can always speak for himself.

I will say to the majority leader that what I object to is the arbitrary action of the President in his high-handed and autocratic removal of Dr. Morgan in violation of the law of the land and in defiance of Congress.

I also resent the fact that the President did not demand an investigation. All the President did in his message to Congress was to say, "Why, the Congress has the power." Of course, we knew we had the power. We did not have to be told by the President we had the power to investigate, but he made no recommendation for an investigation by the Congress; and this is a fact, and it stands as a fact over his own writing in the official records of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. If the President had made such a recommendation, that probably would have been taken as some more Executive dictation.

Mr. FISH. Well, he has never been afraid of Executive dictation or sending to Congress a list of his must legislation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. Did not the nature of that inquiry at the White House, if you can term it that, partake of the character of a police court third degree, with the President baiting this very distinguished engineer and public officer who insisted he had the right or it was his duty under the law to be tried by the Congress? What I want to impress on the gentleman and ask if he does not concur in my statement, is that this was in the nature of a baiting, police court third degree, with the result never in doubt.

Mr. FISH. I agree with the gentleman and I may say further that I used similar words just a few minutes ago when I compared it to the OGPU methods used by the secret police of the Communists.

Mr. CULKIN. No one questions the distinguished character of Chairman Morgan as an engineer or as an American.

Mr. FISH. They never had up to the time of his removal.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman allow me to say this to the gentleman from New York? I have heard the gentleman on the minority make a similar broadcast about the T. V. A. and the whole set-up, but I never heard any member of the minority party get up here and defend Chairman Morgan before the President dismissed him.

Mr. FISH. I was not aware of the fact that he needed any defense. I have never discussed his administration. I have never discussed the T. V. A. I do not believe that an honest and honorable public servant needs anyone to defend him. He has the right to speak for himself and can always do so.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I may make this reply in view of that statement? I have repeatedly, at least in the committee records, commended Chairman Morgan on his ability and his procedure.

Mr. RAYBURN. I said on the floor of the House.

Mr. CULKIN. I do not know that I have done that here, but it is a matter of record.

Mr. FISH. I now desire to turn to an entirely different subject, as I am sure you will agree when I mention it. It has to do somewhat with the War Department bill now before us, and I wish to apply my remarks to the members of the Military Affairs Committee of the House and to the members of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations of the House.

There, apparently, is a discrimination in the armed forces of the United States against colored soldiers. Colored sol-

diery are only permitted to serve in the Infantry and in the Cavalry.

When we consider these War Department bills and for national defense we aim to obtain the greatest amount of national defense possible for the funds involved. I am one of those who does not believe that there should be any fear or any alarm of war in the near future in the United States, but we have the responsibility of building up our national defense. I know from war service overseas that foreign governments, particularly Great Britain and France, have always made use of the colored people from their colonies in their armed forces. The Senegalese, colored French soldiers, served throughout the World War with distinction.

In our Army we do not permit colored men to serve in the Coast Artillery or in the Tank Corps, the Engineer Corps, the Chemical Warfare Service, Field Artillery, the Signal Corps, and special services, including the Air Corps. It seems to me that if we are building for national defense we have to do away with these discriminations and injustices to one-tenth of our population.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. STARNES. The gentleman from New York was a distinguished soldier in the recent war. He will recall that none of the aviators or officers in the coast defense or artillery in the British or French Armies were Senegalese or other colored troops.

Mr. FISH. I am not sure about that; whether that is the fact or not. I do not know much about the Coast Artillery. I have an idea that they were used for all services in the French Army. I do not know about the British Army. The fact is in our Army we have two colored regiments of Infantry and two of Cavalry. They are badly split up and used often as servants, menials, and orderlies. What I would like to see is one single colored division, with all of the services that go into a division—Artillery, Infantry, Engineers, and every other service, including tanks, if a division has a Tank Corps. I would also like to see Congress pass a law empowering the President of the United States to appoint two colored men to West Point each year. Fifty years ago Colonel Young, a colored man, graduated from West Point. Since that time few or no colored men have graduated from West Point.

I do not see much progress being made for the colored race if 50 years ago one of their group could qualify and today a colored officer cannot qualify. The only way I can see to overcome this injustice, this discrimination, would be to empower the President of the United States to appoint two colored men each year to the Military Academy at West Point, which would mean eight colored cadets altogether after civil-service examinations, so that he would appoint only those who are qualified and who could remain in West Point, and who in time of war could be officers in colored divisions and serve in the colored regiments we now have. Why should we, a free country, deny the same right they have in France and in Great Britain? We talk about the progress that the colored race has made in the last 75 years. I do not see this progress, at least in the Army. They seem to be making progress by going backward. The time has come to bring this issue out in the open and discuss it on its merits and from the point of view of justice and national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. FISH. I hope the Committee on Military Affairs, when a proper bill is presented, will grant a hearing as to the advisability of creating one colored division. We now have four colored regiments and I think they should be combined into a single colored division in the armed forces of the United States, and in addition to that we should permit colored men to qualify for every one of the services in our Army, including the Air Corps. Why should not a colored man if he is to serve in the Infantry and die for his country, also be permitted to serve in the Air Corps or in the Artil-

lery, if he is to serve his country in time of need and emergency? In other words, if he is to wear the uniform of our country, he must be treated the same way as all others, and no one has a right to deny that service equality.

If a colored man is good enough to die for his country, he is entitled to the same treatment as any white soldier. His life is just as dear to his family as the life of any white man is to his family. There should be no discrimination whatever in the armed forces in the United States. All services should be open to every colored citizen on the basis of merit and by act of Congress. I propose to introduce within a short time a bill opening up all of the branches of our armed forces, or rather of the War Department and of the Army, to all our colored citizens. We permit aliens to serve in our Army and in all units of our Army. Why not permit loyal, honest, patriotic colored men to serve in time of peace as well as in time of war in every branch of the Army of the United States?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND].

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, according to Greek mythology, as every school boy knows, the great Achilles, the son of Peleus and Thetis, a model to all the Greeks of ancient days for valor, beauty, strength, and chivalry was invulnerable in every part except his heel. According to the myth, when he was a baby his mother held him by the heel and dipped him in the river Styx. Wherever the water touched him no weapon could hurt him, but his heel was not covered by the water.

So years later in the Trojan War, Paris, son of Priam, shot an arrow which wounded him in the heel and the supposedly invulnerable Achilles died as a result of that wound. He was vulnerable in only one point, but that was sufficient to cause his death.

When we consider problems of national defense, when we think of the area to be defended and for which we must make provision for national defense, I have often wondered whether the Territory of Alaska, which is just as much a part of the United States as is the State of Maine or the State of Texas or the State of California, is not the Achilles heel of our national defense situation. I am apprehensive, Mr. Chairman, lest this Achilles' heel of our national defense may some day, perhaps not so far in the future, result in disaster to the people of the United States.

If any reasonable man has two doors to his house, and in that house he keeps articles of great value, such as might tempt the cupidity of the criminal and the ruthless, he does not lock and bolt and bar one door of that house, and make it impregnable, and at the same time leave the other door open. Yet that is precisely what has been done, and that is the condition that exists, with respect to our plans for defense of the Pacific coast of the United States.

Great pains have been taken, Mr. Chairman, to provide defensive works for the Hawaiian Islands in the mid-Pacific. It has been said times without number that the Hawaiian Islands are the key of the Pacific. No one will deny, I think, that the Hawaiian Islands are important. We have put hundreds of millions of dollars in the defenses of those islands and the great base at Pearl Harbor; and many people are of the opinion that that is all that is necessary in the Pacific, that it is not necessary or desirable to install any defensive works in the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. GREEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. GREEVER. How many miles are there in the coast line of Alaska?

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, recently I checked the data I had concerning the coast line of Alaska and found that the coast line of Alaska exceeds in length the total coast line of the main body of the United States including the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts, according to figures furnished me by the Department of Commerce. It appears that the total coast line of the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific

coasts, measured in 3-mile units which do not take into consideration every slight configuration of the coast, is 12,877 miles. The total coast line of Alaska, measured by the same units, is 15,132 miles; so, although the Territory is only about one-fifth the size of the continental United States, the coast line of Alaska, on account of its indentations and configurations, exceeds in length the total coast line of the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts of the United States.

Mr. GREEVER. Do the figures the gentleman gives include the inside passage to all of the vulnerable parts of the Territory?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes; that includes all parts of the Territory, and these figures are strictly comparative, being based upon the same method of measurement.

Mr. GREEVER. How much fortification has the United States in and around Alaska at the present time, coast defenses and other defenses?

Mr. DIMOND. Answering the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming, I am obliged, sadly, to say that Alaska has practically no defense. Alaska has no coast defenses whatsoever. Alaska has at the present time about 300 Infantry who are stationed at Chilcoat Barracks, a military post near the city of Haines, Alaska. There is no other military or naval force in Alaska except the pilots and the personnel of about six Navy planes which are stationed at Sitka a part of the time; they are not always there. Outside of that, Alaska does not possess a single thing in the way of defense.

Mr. GREEVER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIMOND. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. GREEVER. Considering the great extent of the coast line of Alaska, I am very much astonished to find that there is so little in the way of coast defense. I did not know it before, and I do not think it is generally known. I know that the gentleman is familiar with Alaska and I know how well he has represented that Territory here in the House, and how faithfully he has done it. [Applause.] Is it not true that recently the strategic, military, and naval importance of Alaska has been greatly stressed in the minds of the people of the United States and of the people who live in that Territory?

Mr. DIMOND. Answering the gentleman, I may say that the people of the Territory have never been in any doubt about it. I was glad to note in the recent debate on the bill increasing the size of the Navy that some mention was made of Alaska. So far as I can recall, it is seldom since I have been in Congress that any mention has been made by a Member of the House except myself concerning the need of installing defensive works in Alaska.

A few years ago, about 1935, I was greatly encouraged by the outlook after extensive hearings by the House Committee on Military Affairs on the so-called Wilcox bill, the Army Air Corps bill, which, I think, was passed unanimously and approved by the President. That bill provided for six large, principal, or main Army Air Corps bases in different parts of the United States, including one in the Territory of Alaska. The base in Alaska was not authorized lightly or without consideration. Extensive hearings were held by the Committee on Military Affairs, and the importance of Alaska from the military defense standpoint was stressed in this hearing; so the committee was fully informed. The Alaska base being authorized in the bill, it had the full support, I have every reason to believe, of the General Staff of the Army, as well as of the Members of the House and Senate, and of the President of the United States. But from that time to this, Mr. Chairman, not a single dollar has been spent in Alaska, not a single thing has been done in Alaska toward carrying out the expressed will of Congress and the expressed will of the President with respect to the building of the authorized Army Air Corps base in the Territory of Alaska. I am reliably informed that in 1936 the War Department sent an estimate to the Budget to be included in last year's bill in the sum of \$1,500,000 for the commencement of construction of the authorized Army Air Corps base in Alaska, but the Budget rejected it. This year, I am told,

and I have no doubt as to the accuracy of the information, no estimate was sent to the Budget by the War Department because the Budget had given orders in advance that the sum available for new construction by the War Department would be so limited that no work in Alaska could possibly be undertaken. So we have the situation, Mr. Chairman, where the Bureau of the Budget is apparently largely making the military policy of the country.

I have brought here, as you see, a map, or chart, of the North Pacific Ocean. It is known as a great circle sailing chart of the North Pacific and is used by navigators in sailing that ocean. This chart is used because it illustrates, as nothing else except a globe can illustrate, the strategic importance of Alaska in any sound plan of national defense. In presenting this matter to Congress I am not so much actuated by the fact that I have the honor to represent here the Territory of Alaska as by the fact that I am a citizen of the United States, and so I am alarmed about the safety of the United States as long as Alaska is left undefended.

You see on the chart here before you, the great circle sailing chart of the North Pacific Ocean, the relative positions of the Japanese Archipelago, Siberia, Alaska, including the Aleutian Islands, Canada, and the United States. There is one feature of this chart to which I desire especially to invite your attention. Any straight line drawn on the chart is the shortest distance between the two points it connects thereon. The chart distorts otherwise the relative positions of the several features shown thereon, but a straight line drawn between any two places on that chart indicates the shortest distances between those two places, because the chart is so made up that a straight line thereon indicates a segment of a great circle of the earth, and I need not explain that a great circle on the earth is one which if extended into a plane would pass through the center of the earth. Any globe representing the earth will show the idea clearly.

You will observe that I have drawn three straight lines on the chart. The line farthest to the north connects Yokohama with Seattle. You will see that this line passes north of a considerable number of the Aleutian Islands. The next straight line to the south of the first connects Yokohama with Portland, Oreg. It will be observed that this line passes through some of the Aleutians, so that if a ship sailed in the straight, short line directly from Yokohama to Portland, Oreg., it would be necessary for that ship to go overland part of the way when it came to the Aleutian Islands. The most southerly of the lines goes straight from Yokohama to San Francisco and that line passes approximately 276 statute miles south of the Aleutians. You will also note the position of the Hawaiian Islands, and that none of these lines connecting Yokohama and the cities on the Pacific coast of the United States—Seattle, Portland, and San Francisco—comes within 2,000 miles of the Hawaiian Islands.

Right now it may be well to refer for a moment to distances, and in all cases I shall use the statute or land mile as the unit of measurement. The straight, short great-circle route between Seattle and Yokohama, going north of some of the Aleutian Islands and south of others, is 4,924 miles. But suppose the journey is made from Yokohama to the Hawaiian Islands, and thence to the nearest large city on the Pacific coast, San Francisco, we find that the distance is 6,316 miles. In other words the distance from Yokohama to the United States by way of the Hawaiian Islands is approximately 1,400 miles longer than the straight, short great-circle route which runs near or through the Aleutian chain. The distance between the Aleutians and Honolulu is approximately 2,356 miles. The distance between San Francisco and Honolulu is about 2,408 miles, almost an equal distance. The distance from Seattle to Ketchikan, Alaska, is 747 miles. The distance from Seattle to Unalaska or Dutch Harbor in the Aleutians is 1,966 miles. The distance from Dutch Harbor to the island of Attu, the westernmost of the Aleutians, is 810 miles. And the distance from Attu to the great Japanese harbor on Paramushiru Island, near the northerly

end of the Japanese Archipelago, is 716 miles. From Paramushiru to Yokohama is about 1,400 miles.

In other words, the Aleutians are closer to Seattle than are the Hawaiian Islands to San Francisco. The Aleutians are about as far from the Hawaiian Islands as the Hawaiian Islands are from the mainland of the United States at San Francisco. Now the point that I wish to suggest to you is this: A hostile fleet moving across the north Pacific certainly will not come by way of the Hawaiian Islands where we have a naval base and an air base that are said to be well-nigh impregnable, but will come instead on the short line—some 1,400 miles shorter—along the Aleutians, where we have precisely nothing on land or sea by way of defense. We have locked the back door and put plenty of extra bolts on it, and even walled it up with masonry, and at the same time we have left the front door wide open. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there is little point in providing defenses for the Hawaiian Islands while Alaska is left naked to any possible enemy.

I remember as a schoolboy reading in a history of the War between the States of the remarkable success of one of the generals of the South. When he was asked to explain his basic theory of military strategy or tactics that enabled him to be uniformly successful, he said in substance that his plan was to get there first with the most men. A moment ago the able and courteous gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], in answer to my inquiry, informed me that I had in mind the great General Forrest as the one who believed on being on the battlefield first with the most men, and who thus won his amazing victories. Even to one who knows nothing of the military art, the rule seems a wise one. And by that rule, with Alaska defenseless, we will lose at least the first battle of any future war in the Pacific, for the nation which first seizes and holds the Aleutians and the coast of Alaska will have control of the inner, short line from the Orient to the United States. Remember that Ketchikan, Alaska, is only 747 miles from Seattle.

The establishment of the Army Air Corps base in Alaska, as Congress must have intended in passing the Wilcox Act, would at least be a mighty factor in giving us control of the inner and short line. That base should be large enough to accommodate at least 1,000 fighting planes. With such a force on its flank, it is not likely that any enemy would risk an attempted seizure of Alaska with the idea of making it a base of operations against the United States.

But at the present time the Army has no facilities whatever in Alaska. We read a few days ago that the so-called flying fortresses made a trip to the Argentine Republic. Those ships could not be sent to Alaska because in all of Alaska there are no fields and no facilities to accommodate them. Is it possible that we are more concerned about the welfare of the Argentine than we are for the safety and welfare of Alaska? Alaska at the present time is as lacking in defensive works and facilities as a babe in arms. This is a serious matter for the people of Alaska, and it is 10 times as serious for the people of the United States, for if a hostile foreign power were to get possession of Alaska we would be obliged to then expend in the defense of the main body of the United States more billions of dollars than it would now take millions to install adequate defense works in Alaska, including, first of all, the Army air base.

Some of the land-hungry and resource-hungry nations of the world would consider themselves as economic royalists if they had Alaska, with its developed and potential wealth of minerals and forests and fisheries and agricultural and grazing lands, ample for the support under proper conditions of millions of people. Vigorous efforts are being made by our Government to develop trade between nations. Let us consider for a moment the trade between the United States and Alaska and the trade between the United States and some of the foreign nations. For 1937 the total trade between the United States and Alaska amounted to approximately \$124,000,000. I have not been able to obtain the figures showing the trade between the United States and foreign countries for 1937, but I have here some figures for

1936, and I shall use these figures for comparison with the commerce with Alaska in 1937. It appears that the commerce between the United States and Alaska almost equaled that with Mexico; exceeded the commerce with Belgium; greatly exceeded the commerce with Australia; exceeded the commerce with Argentina, to which we sent the flying fortresses; exceeded our commerce with the Netherlands; exceeded our commerce with China, and here we may pause to remember the efforts we have to maintain the "open door" in China; exceeded our commerce with Sweden; was more than twice our commerce with Soviet Russia, and may we pause again and reflect upon the pains to which we have gone to develop trade with Soviet Russia; and exceeded our commerce with Colombia, and with British India, and with Poland, and with Spain, in some cases as much as 2 to 1.

Let us return to the Alaska trade for a moment and consider the 1937 figures, which show imports into Alaska from the United States of a total of \$43,083,998, and exports from Alaska to the United States of \$80,967,183. With respect to any foreign nation, such a balance of trade might be considered disadvantageous to the United States, but that is not the case with regard to Alaska. The greatest of the wealth-producing industries in Alaska are owned and operated by citizens of the United States, who reside and pay taxes in the States. Those persons are mostly stockholders of great corporations operating in Alaska. All or practically all of the surplus wealth produced in Alaska—roughly the difference between the exports and the imports—finds its way promptly into the pockets of the owners who live in the United States. The amount of wealth thus contributed each year by Alaska to the States is all but incredible. Therefore, what upon superficial examination may seem with respect to Alaska a balance of trade against the United States, is in reality just the opposite. The wealth of Alaska is being piped or channeled into the exchequers of the people who reside in the States and who own the wealth-producing agencies of Alaska. Fortunately, with the exception of the minerals, those wealth-producing agencies involve the use of resources, like the salmon fishery, that are annually replenished by nature, and with proper care should be inexhaustable. I have mentioned this only to rebut the idea, which is all too common, that the Territory of Alaska is nothing but a land of ice and snow, and is a liability to the United States which we would be better off without. In truth and in fact Alaska is a priceless asset, and in any other part of the world its potential wealth would long before this day have been the cause of half a dozen wars. Italy has spent uncounted millions to acquire possession of Ethiopia, and the conquered land, according to the most reliable reports, is not one quarter the value of Alaska.

I have somewhat digressed, Mr. Chairman, and I shall return to the subject. Alaska should be defended. Defensive works should be installed in the Territory. The first thing to be done is the construction of the Army air base. Under best conditions several years will be required to complete that base, and we should begin now. When this bill is read for amendment I intend to propose an amendment calling for the expenditure during the fiscal year 1939 of \$2,000,000 for commencement of work on the Alaska Army air base, and I sincerely hope that the amendment will be agreed to and the work promptly prosecuted to completion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LUECKE].

Mr. LUECKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, much has been said on the floor in recent days and weeks in regard to war and world conditions in general; but it seems that we continue to disregard conditions at home. To my way of thinking, unemployment is one of the vital questions facing this Congress, and one which should be discussed more freely than it has been. It is vital to our democratic institutions to restore these 12,000,000 unemployed men to work. We should find work for them in industry. Of course, the W. P. A. cannot go on forever, and, besides, these men do not want to stay on relief for the rest of their lives.

In 1937, last year, when production was up to 92 percent of normal, taking the production figures of 1929 as the basis, there were still 7,000,000 unemployed. In order to put those 7,000,000 men back to work, production would have had to go far above the 1929 figure. What does that mean? It means these 7,000,000 workers will remain permanently unemployed, and that is the problem facing the American people today.

I do not like the idea of building a wall of steel around this Nation and have it decay in the center. That is the real danger to our democracy. We have got to put these men back on the job.

How are we going to do it? If we look back over the economic history of this Nation, we will find that 75 years ago the hours constituting a regular workday were all the way from 12 to 16, and many of our industries, because they did not have the modern illuminating system which we have today, worked their men from sunrise to sunset.

As we continue along in our investigation of our economic history we find the hours were cut down to 12, then to 10, and finally to 8. I can remember when the 8-hour day was still unpopular. That was in 1900, at which time some 200,000 miners or more went out on strike for an 8-hour day with 10 hours' pay. That strike lasted 8 months, but the miners finally were successful. Those men who went out at that time for an 8-hour day with 10 hours' pay might have been called Bolsheviks, although the word had not been coined at that time. We called them radicals. However, they were victorious. The Nation went on as before. The companies went on making as much money as they had made theretofore, and everything went along as well as could be expected.

It was also about that time that the railroads went on the 8-hour day. It so happened I was railroading at that time. I remember men were working all the way from 16 to 20 and 24 hours and as long as 72 hours in one stretch. Then they got an 8-hour day in the railroad stations and a 16-hour day for the trainmen. The trade craft unions took the matter up and adopted an 8-hour day. Today it is the popular thing.

Mr. Chairman, we have now come to the time when we must again reduce the hours of work in order to take care of the unemployed. The time has come that we must adopt the 6-hour day in industry that can support it. A year ago I introduced a resolution which was referred to the Committee on Labor asking for an investigation into the 6-hour day of those industries which could support it, but nothing was ever done.

One of the gentlemen testifying before the Unemployment Committee in the Senate not long ago, I think it was Mr. du Pont, stated that for every one man employed in industry there are required two indirectly to keep that man working and to keep him supplied. What does this mean?

It so happens I looked into this matter a little further and I found that the highly efficient industries, such as automobile, steel, rubber, and the basic industries, including the textile industry, could adopt a 6-hour day. If they did it would mean that between three and four million men would be put back to work.

Now if we follow out the theory that one man in industry reemploys two indirectly, you will have not only the 3 million men put back to work but you will have six million others indirectly reemployed; so that in the end there would be 9 million workers returned to industry.

It has been said that the 6-hour day is farfetched, that it is radical and it might look like a little too much gravity, but, to the contrary, it is fundamental Americanism. There is nothing radical about it. It is just fundamental Americanism to shorten the workday in order to meet unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, industry itself has not been the only one affected by these technological improvements which have resulted in putting men out of work. About a week ago an Illinois farmer came into my office and made the following statement. He said that in 1920 he harvested 138 acres of wheat and he gave 96 man-days employment. He stated

further he harvested at the rate of 24 bushels to the acre. He told me that in 1937 he harvested the same number of acres, 138 acres, but gave only 9 man-days employment and harvested 419 more bushels of wheat than he did in 1920. In other words, he took his modern wheat combine and went out into the field and harvested his own crop.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LUECKE of Michigan. There you have an illustration of what modern improvements and modern methods of production are doing to the workingman.

I may cite another instance of a farmer who said to me when I was back in my district, "Twenty-five years ago my two sons and myself thought we were doing a big season's work and having a fine crop if we harvested 500 bushels of potatoes, but now my two sons are gone, I am 25 years older, and I harvest 5,000 bushels of potatoes alone with a tractor and modern farming implements."

How long can this trend go on? Obviously we must do something about this condition, because it will not cure itself. We must see that these men are put back to work in wealth-producing jobs. I know work created under the W. P. A. has been worth while. School houses have been built and farm-to-market roads have been built; but, still and all, there is this production of wealth which is being missed in the way of consumers' products and in the way of making for better homes.

What is a man going to do nowadays, if he is over 40 years of age? This condition has been brought about by the modern machine. A man over 40 years of age is out on the street. If gray hairs show underneath his hat, he may as well stay away from the employment office. What are we going to do with the millions who are coming out of school each fall seeking employment? Are we going to say to them, "We cannot do anything for you; all jobs have been filled, and you must go on a permanent Government job of some kind?"

You and I know they do not want that, and let us be thankful for it. The average American worker wants to work at some honest method of production, some honest way of making his living as he has been taught to make it. It is easy enough to say to these men, "If you cannot get a job in industry, why do you not go out and start a little farm or something of that sort?" I want to say to you that these men who have given their lives, in many cases as high as 40 years, to service in these industrial plants are not fit for anything else. You cannot ask a man who has done that to become a farmer any more than you can ask a farmer to go into an industrial plant.

This thing of asking a man to work 3 days in a mill and 3 days in raising his own vegetables in his own garden will never work out, in my opinion, for the reason you can do only one thing at a time and do it right. You must either work in a factory or work on a farm, and you cannot do both at the same time. Therefore, that plan is out of the picture.

It so happens that immediately after the war when I came back from France I found my trade had flown out of the window. In one plant where 3,000 men had previously worked at their trade there were now machines, and the force had been cut down to 500, and girls receiving \$16 a week were doing the work. I had to start life all over again.

THE 6-HOUR DAY

Every day the handwriting on the wall appears for some workers somewhere. A recent case to come to hand is that of the Grier works at New Castle, Pa., owned by the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Co., a subsidiary of United States Steel.

The management announced the dismantling of the Grier works, which employed 1,200 men, making steel by methods requiring considerable hand labor.

Was this due to bad business or to lack of confidence on the part of the management, as many critics would have us believe about business in general?

Far from it. The Grier mill was to be replaced by one of the 26 new huge mills that have been constructed during the

past several years in which the production processes are highly mechanized, so that now 80 men can average a production of 800 tons in an 8-hour day, whereas formerly the same number of men, working by hand processes, could produce only 90 tons a day.

To put it another way, the 800 tons of sheet steel would formerly have required 640 men's work to make it in a day's time. Since it now requires only 80, we find by simple subtraction that 560 men have been displaced by the new equipment. What this means is that seven out of every eight men who used to work in the mills is, or will soon be, out of a job. Can we expect to reduce unemployment when men are being constantly turned out of their jobs?

Some people will, of course, try to deny the fact that we need a general 6-hour day to help get our unemployed back to work. These people will say, "Oh, the steelworkers' case is just an accident and not at all typical."

For the benefit of those in doubt let us see what has happened in the slaughtering and meat-packing industry. On the average, every hour a man worked in 1933, he produced 62 percent more than in 1920. This change resulted from the use of conveyors and handling devices, as well as readjusting processes, so that there were fewer motions and shorter distances to be covered. If the worker has to move his arm only half as far as previously in some operation, it is obvious that he can have two movements where he had only one before. This has enabled the meat industry to get more work out of each man.

Figures are available in the boot and shoe industry which show that for every hour a man works at that trade today, he produces 50 percent more than he did back in 1914. This change came about not so much on account of actual labor-saving devices, but due to a change in the product itself. Formerly almost all footwear had sewed soles. Now there is mass production of cemented-sole boots and shoes, with the labor required for the new type being much less than what it had been for the old. It is true that there has been an increase in demand for shoes due to style changes for women, but this has not offset the labor displacement, for the present policy is to make shoes less durable and at lower price. Had the 6-hour day been gradually introduced into the shoe industry, we could have avoided technological unemployment of the 9,000 men since 1923 as to the footwear trade.

According to Dr. Charles F. Roos, former director of research of the National Recovery Administration, a worker in the tire and rubber industry now produces double what he did 10 years ago. In other words, one man can now do the work of two. This came about through the introduction of a number of important improvements in machinery and production methods, which have made the process almost entirely automatic. Since the labor cost of making tires has thus declined considerably and production per man per hour has correspondingly increased, plus insufficient increase in demand for tires to offset these factors, there has been displacement of men by machines.

Are we going to sit idly by and let these technological changes cost us billions of dollars in supporting millions of our fellow citizens without work, due to no fault of their own? Or will we be rational and split the work to be done among all who are ready, willing, and able to do it?

Some further cases of workers being displaced by machines have been published within the past several weeks as joint studies of the Works Progress Administration and the Department of Labor. One of these is entitled "Mechanical Changes in the Cotton Textile Industry, 1910 to 1936."

Here we find a striking example of long-range effects aside from the depression following 1929. By going back to 1910, we can make a comparison of what has happened since the time of the pre-war generation. Take the weaving of terry cloth. In 1910 it took two 40-hour shifts of 1,186 men to produce 700,000 yards of cloth. Today two 40-hour shifts of 276 men can produce the same amount of cloth. This is a drop of 75 percent of the amount of labor required for the same amount of product. One man now with an

automatic loom can produce what it took four men to do in 1910, thus causing the other three to be out of work.

It is true that the weaving of terry cloth is one of the worst cases of displacement, but even in other materials we find a similar tendency. There was a reduction of 27 percent in the labor costs of weaving sheeting between 1910 and 1936, and similar reductions in other fabrics ranging up to 37.5 percent reduction as to combed broadcloth.

In the so-called carding of textiles, the first operation usually, the number of workers is now about half what was needed to produce the same amount in 1910; for example, combed broadcloth carding that required 218 workers in 1910 now takes only 108 for like quantities; sheeting that took 238 then needs but 112 now; and canton flannel that required 290 is today carded by only 148 men.

Spinning operations have shown reductions in labor time needed ranging from 24 percent in producing combed broadcloth, up to 31.3 percent for terry cloth, these improvements being due to improvements in spinning machinery as well as to controlled air moisture and temperature which reduced breakage of cotton fibers which occurs when they are too dry.

In the spooling and warping of textiles, the decrease in man-hour requirements since 1910 has ranged from 54.5 percent in carded filling satten to 63.9 percent in combed broadcloth. Some explanation for the considerable reduction in the possible labor requirements may be found in the fact that in 1910 a spooling machine averaged approximately 0.33 pounds of yarn per hour, while in 1936 the machine could process 1.83 pounds of yarn, or almost six times as much. Similarly, in 1910 a warper averaged 31.3 pounds of yarn per hour, as against an average of 328 pounds now.

When man is clever enough to invent spooling machines which automatically tie necessary knots in the fabric, why can he not see that the worker should get some of the benefits of efficiency in shorter hours and better pay, as well as the employer making more profits for himself.

As a matter of fairness we must admit a certain amount of offset to the textile labor displacements just mentioned. It is true that miscellaneous men such as electricians, scrubbers, humidity men, truck drivers, yardmen, and such increased up to 18 percent over 1910, and there is another offset due to the work involved in manufacturing the labor-saving new machinery. Yet these offsets are only a fraction as compared to the total numbers of persons displaced.

A good way to think of the situation of unemployment as a whole is to compare it with a man with a team of horses. If he uses the team only part of the time and turns it loose on the public when not using it, something has to be done about it to make him take care of his own horses. It should be obvious that he may not turn them out on the public highway, nor let them pasture on other people's land. Neither can he permit those mules to die in front of another man's house.

Yet this is what industry dares to do in this country now. It turns loose its employed or employable workers to die in front of your house or mine for all it cares. We have millions of people now who would die except that the Government has changed its policy toward giving public relief since 1932.

Whenever an effort is made to raise the standard of living and well-being of the average man, immediately an attempt is made to set up a line of hostility between the farmer and the wage earner. There is no such natural line of hostility. There is no reason why better wages should injure the farmer or increased farm prices should harm the worker in industry. The farmer depends upon principally the wage earners for his customers. He cannot depend upon that upper 2 percent of the population that gets most of the incomes in the United States. The wage earner must, in turn, depend upon the farmer to buy the cloth, the automobiles, or the radios that he makes, so that the farmer and the wage earner are naturally drawn together and cannot be separated.

How can there be hostility between the farmer and the wage earner when they are each other's customers? The

solvent wage earner can pay more for butter, meat and bread, and other products than the insolvent. Similarly, the farmer who is solvent can pay a good deal more for the products of the factory than one who is insolvent. What we must do is to raise the purchasing power of both farmer and wage earner. With the cooperation of both we can keep going forward and help everyone get more of the things he wants and has a right to demand. President Roosevelt expressed it this way on March 5, 1934:

We must remember that the bulk of the market for American industry is among the 90 percent of our people who live on wages and salaries, and only 10 percent of that market is among people who live on profits alone. No one is opposed to sensible and reasonable profits—but the morality of the case is that a great segment of our people are in actual distress; and that as between profits first and humanity afterward we have no room for hesitation. With millions still unemployed, the power of our people to purchase and use the products of industry is still greatly curtailed. * * *. Therefore, I give to industry today this challenge: It is the immediate task of industry to reemploy more people at purchasing wages, and to do it now. Only thus can we continue recovery and restore the balance we seek. It is worth while keeping in the front of our heads the thought that the people in the country whose incomes are less than \$2,000 a year buy more than two-thirds of all the goods sold here. It is logical that if the total amount that goes in wages to this group of human beings is steadily increased, merchants, employers, and investors will in the long run get more income from the increased volume of sales.

Turning from the President's words back to actual cases, we find some shocking figures in the careful study published last June by the National Resources Committee and entitled "Technological Trends and National Policy." One of the special merits of this work is that it takes into account individuals having only part-time or temporary employment. Thus two persons each working only half the time are counted as only one employed person, a method which produces a higher accuracy than ordinary calculations.

According to this report (p. 77) if we take the manufacturing industries such as reported to the Census of Manufactures, we find that a certain amount of work which required a hundred men to do it in a certain amount of time in 1920, can now be done in the same time by only 56 men—a reduction of 44 out of the 100 men or almost half.

In mining industries the reduction has not been quite as great—81 men can do what 100 did in 1920, a reduction of 19 out of the hundred. In the telephone industry the change was more than in mining, the drop since 1920 being 25 out of the hundred for the same amount of work done. Here the change was brought about partly by the growing use of the automatic dial-telephone equipment which threw operators out of work, although needing extra mechanical labor for installing the equipment.

In order to think clearly on the subject of the 6-hour day, we must first cease to regard the period of the middle twenties as a "normal" to be considered our goal to be returned to. This point of view neglects the fact that a country like ours with its continuously increasing population must regard "normal" as a process of ever-increasing levels of production, employment and income. If the quantity produced by labor in a certain quantity of time remained the same, the total amount of things produced would have to rise as fast as the labor supply in order to keep the volume of unemployment from increasing.

However, given our progressive increases in the amount each worker can produce, a decline in production such as the recent depression brings about a still greater amount of decline in employment than one would think, and an increase in production results in a less than proportional increase in employment. So, since we cannot seem to increase the total volume of production at a faster rate than the increase in our labor supply, there is nothing else to do other than shortening the workday if we are to avoid an ever-increasing volume of unemployment. This is a purely engineering and practical side of the question, yet it points in the same direction as the righteous and just feeling that every worker should be entitled to share in the benefits of improved efficiency in industry, not only in wages but in leisure too.

There is an important consideration to be kept in mind as to the benefits of increased leisure on reducing unemployment. Not only would the 6-hour day cause more employment directly, on the work-sharing basis, but by maintaining weekly wages at present levels the total purchasing power of labor would be increased as has been often pointed out. An additional factor that has not been emphasized so much is that having more leisure will promote a greater consumption of many goods such as automobiles, electrical appliances, and various home comforts. The more time people have for themselves the more they will have time to go to shows, to read books or magazines or newspapers, to burn gas and oil in their cars, or go to other amusements. All these would help make places for those now unemployed.

Another way in which the 6-hour day would help stimulate business indirectly is that it would cause an increase in the number of employees in not only large-city areas but also in small towns where factories were located. Such an increase in personnel would in some cases draw newcomers to the small town to work and would often cause a brisk demand for new housing for them to appear. In that way the lagging construction industry would be stimulated and more of the home building which President Roosevelt has called for would be stimulated.

For those who still refuse to be convinced or to be open-minded on the question of the 6-hour day, I want to call attention to the fact that these principles were presented back in 1819—a century ago—by the eminent Swiss economist, J. C. L. Simonde de Sismondi, in his book *Nouveau Principes D'Economie Politique*. Although Sismondi pointed out that technical advances were causing undue hardships to certain classes, he made it plain that he did not wish to stop or hinder the advance of science and invention. He demanded only that the advantages of efficiency be spread to all as rapidly as possible, and closed his book with the following very up-to-date recommendations:

First. Abolition of child labor.

Second. Shortening the length of the work day.

Third. Setting of minimum wages.

Fourth. Encouragement of labor organization and collective bargaining. Far from being radical, our demand for a 6-hour day is really ultraconservative in view of a century-old precedent for shorter hours, both in theory and practice.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUTPHIN].

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Chairman, in this day we are endeavoring to serve the job maker. We are giving him every encouragement; but, at the same time, is not the Government encroaching on his activities? Is not the Government engaging in new fields of commercial activity every day?

During the recent hearings on the bill under discussion today, the Quartermaster General, General Gibson, testified before the committee—at page 190 of the hearings—regarding the relative cost of uniforms and shirts, comparing Government factory costs with the costs of private contractors. I find that contract figures do not agree with the general's statement.

In his figures for breeches, cotton, khaki, he has listed the commercial contract cost as \$1.205249, but upon investigation I find the last contract awarded was as of September 15, 1937, for 75,990 pairs of cotton breeches, the award being made to the Philadelphia Uniform Co. at a unit price of 82 cents. This represents a considerable discrepancy between the \$1.20 which the quartermaster general states these breeches have cost and the actual award.

The commercial contract cost of breeches, elastique, is listed at \$1.1324662, while the last contract awarded by the Government was to the Champion Pants Manufacturing Co., of New York City, on October 1, 1937, at a unit price of 72 cents less one-fourth of 1 percent.

The Quartermaster General has listed the commercial contract cost of coats, serge, at \$2.514773, while on October 1, 1937, the contract awarded was for 7,108 coats, to the Sig-

mund Eisner Co., of Red Bank, N. J., at a unit price of \$1.73 less one-tenth of 1 percent.

Another award was made for 2,400 coats on October 28, 1937, to the same concern at a unit price of \$2.45 less one-tenth of 1 percent. This was a relatively small quantity, with 39 assorted sizes, which is probably the reason for the increased cost.

Cotton trousers, khaki, which is one of the very large items, are shown in the Quartermaster General's figures as having a commercial contract cost of 81.20444219 cents. The last award was on January 27 of this year to the Philadelphia Uniform Co. for 200,000 pairs of cotton trousers at a unit price of 43 cents, while on November 8, 1937, bids were awarded to the five lowest bidders at bids ranging from 44.89 cents to 48.5 cents.

Now, with reference to cotton shirts, which are probably in more common usage in the Army than any other one item, the last invitation was received on November 5, 1937, for 431,500 shirts. The awards were made to the four lowest bidders. One was to the Morris Trichon Co., of Philadelphia, for 100,000 at a unit cost of 30.25 cents.

Another award was made to the Model Blouse Co., of Millville, N. J., for 220,000 and the cost was 33 cents.

Another award was made to the Cohen-Fein Co., of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., for 50,000 at a cost of 36 cents.

Another award was made to the same company of 50,000 at 37 cents.

The Long Wear Manufacturing Co., of Philadelphia, received an award of 220,000 shirts at 38 cents.

Yet the Quartermaster General told the committee that the cost for commercial manufacture was 50.5 plus cents for cotton shirts.

Another item which is listed here by the Quartermaster General is shirts, flannel. The commercial cost is 44.0058596 cents according to the figures supplied to the committee by the Quartermaster General.

Yet on February 2 of this year an award was made for 500,000 shirts to the Phillips Jones Co., of New York, and the unit price was 26.95 cents.

Mr. Chairman, of course, I do not want to intimate that the Quartermaster General has falsified the figures in any way, because I know that is not true. The impression I want to leave is that I do not believe he is aware of what is going on in his department. I am sure that each and every one of us realizes not only the desirability but the necessity of giving encouragement to every private manufacturer and we certainly cannot do this by permitting awards to be made to Government factories, especially when the astounding fact is that the cost of private manufacture is less than the Government factory cost in every case, and in some cases to an astounding degree.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTPHIN. I yield.

Mr. PARSONS. Does the gentleman from New Jersey believe there has been discrimination in these contracts?

Mr. SUTPHIN. I would like to have an explanation of how he can arrive at these figures showing that the Government cost is lower than private contract cost when the actual facts are the reverse of this. I am looking for enlightenment along that line.

Mr. PARSONS. Not being an employee of the War Department, of course, I cannot give the gentleman such information, but I took it from what the gentleman was saying he thought there had been discrimination.

Mr. SUTPHIN. I want to know how they arrive at these figures, when the award is made to a private contractor for cotton shirts at 30.25 cents, we will say, and then the Department reports the cost to a congressional committee as 50 cents.

Mr. PARSONS. And award the contract on the basis of 30.25 cents?

Mr. SUTPHIN. And award the contract on the basis of 30.25 cents.

Mr. PARSONS. Is that an estimated cost or is that presumed to be actual cost?

Mr. SUTPHIN. I have the actual figures which the private manufacturer receives for each item, and that is what I am submitting here, and I am endeavoring to find out how the Government can arrive at a cost 67 percent in advance of what the manufacturer actually gets, when all these items are made by union labor and under the Walsh-Healey Act.

On page 9 of the committee report on this bill, it is stated:

It is the judgment of the committee, justified by the testimony of the Department, that the division of work now obtaining rather favors commercial interests; in fact, to an extent that is not conducive to the most efficient and economical operation of the Army's depot. Since we have this establishment, it should be operated to capacity on a full normal workday schedule, particularly when there is work to be done of a character that can be turned out at less cost or no greater cost than by private manufacturers.

There are arguments against the national-defense economics of this statement, but the actual facts do not require that we go that deeply into it, for it is a fact that the private manufacturers beat the Government costs, they actually do their manufacturing more economically, and sell to the Government, after paying all their normal costs of operating a private concern in addition to the wages—after meeting many costs the Government does not include in the figures of Government costs—these private concerns still can and do manufacture much more cheaply.

Sound economics and 130,000,000 American people are demanding that we spend only what is necessary to provide adequate and proper governmental services. This demand cannot long permit extravagant costs for Army clothing simply because this clothing is manufactured by a Government-owned factory, to the detriment of private employers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FLETCHER].

ONE WAY TO SAVE MONEY—STOP NEEDLESS DUPLICATION OF STATISTICAL SERVICE

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on the Census, in a recent meeting reported a bill to provide for gathering of statistics on cottonseed, soybeans, corn, and other grain and seed products widely used by manufacturers.

At that meeting, members of the census committee brought out the fact that many governmental agencies and bureaus are duplicating, in a more or less degree, the work already being done by the Bureau of the Census.

Testimony submitted to your committee reveals that the Bureau of the Census is charged, primarily, with the responsibility of gathering statistics and data throughout the United States relating to our current industrial situation and other aspects of our economic life. The duties are entirely those of a service organization. The Bureau of the Census does not possess any regulatory functions.

DUPLICATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

At the same time, the many other agencies of the Executive Branch of the Government are duplicating the work of the Bureau in order to secure facts, figures, and statistics for regulatory and other purposes.

The records will show that the Bureau of the Census, in an effort to cooperate with agencies of other departments that issue statistics, furnishes these agencies data collected by the census enumerators, yet the duplication has increased with corresponding expenditure of Federal funds.

BUSINESSMEN PROTEST

The flood of questionnaires from Federal agencies that must be filled out by business organizations has increased, and this work has become a major task.

Businessmen are required to duplicate, in many instances, the same facts and figures to several different agencies, and they are looking for a remedy.

There is a growing resentment from businessmen against this duplication and many questionnaires are turned down or discarded because the trade organizations do not receive any benefit from the data collected.

The exception to this criticism is in the case of the Bureau of the Census, whose questionnaires are promptly filled out because the Census Office compiles and delivers statistics to

business organizations and trade groups which are valuable to their particular industry.

It has been suggested by many trade organizations, manufacturers, and business groups that the schedules of the Census Bureau be designed to the end that this Bureau may gather complete statistics, including those used by other agencies, and thus avoid duplication wherever possible.

CENSUS BUREAU EFFICIENT

Statements presented to the Census Committee reveal that contacts made by the businessmen with the Bureau of the Census have been very satisfactory. A survey made regarding the service rendered by this bureau shows that business generally will welcome the Bureau of the Census as a central agency for fact-finding through a simplified method, thereby checking the spread of duplicate information furnished to other bureaus and agencies.

Information has come to the Census Committee that some business concerns complain that these Government questionnaires are pyramiding rapidly to the point where they have become a real burden to them.

One manufacturer in returning his questionnaire to the Bureau of the Census took occasion to acquaint the Bureau with the number of forms he had been requested to fill out from other sources, and he took two pages to list and describe the number of questionnaires from various local, State, and governmental agencies.

CENSUS BUREAU HAS EQUIPMENT

Many members of the Census Committee feel that the Bureau of the Census should be the statistical collecting agency of the Government.

The Bureau has all the machinery necessary for tabulating census statistics of every kind acquired through the various Government Bureaus.

Many feel that the Bureau of the Census then should be given the responsibility of gathering the fact-finding data, taking over considerable of the work of the other agencies rather than see these other agencies expend money on expensive mechanical equipment used in compiling statistics when the Government already has adequate equipment in the Bureau of the Census.

Otherwise it is obvious that duplication and expansion of other agencies will continue to waste money.

RESOLUTION TO CORRECT DUPLICATION

Therefore, I have introduced House Resolution No. 449 designed to authorize the Census Committee to obtain information necessary as a basis for legislation with a view to the improvement and coordination of, and the elimination of any duplication, unnecessary expense, or unjustified burden on business organizations and private citizens in connection with statistical services by the Federal Government.

The executive departments, independent establishments, and various agencies of the Government are authorized, under the pending resolution, to furnish such information and assistance as may be deemed necessary by the committee, but the resolution shall not authorize the disclosure of any matter required by law to be held confidential.

The members of our Census Committee expect to conduct a thorough investigation of the charges that there is widespread duplication of Government statistical work and issuance of data.

The Census Committee will appreciate the cooperation of Members of the House, business organizations, and private individuals in submitting testimony and statements that will aid our committee in carrying out the provisions of House Resolution 499.

It is my intention to call a meeting of the committee soon for the purpose of discussing this question, in the hope of finding a way of preventing the needless waste of money resulting from preventable duplication. [Applause.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the great distress in the city of Lowell. The people of Lowell, including the mayor,

the employers, and the employees, are greatly alarmed regarding these reciprocal-trade agreements. The leather workers and the boot and shoe workers are also very much distressed over the decision made by the people who negotiated the reciprocal-trade agreement with Czechoslovakia. The cotton workers are very greatly distressed as well as the workers in the cotton damask industry, the industry that competes with the damask made by Czechoslovakia. They fear their industry may be closed as the boot and shoe workers fear that their industry may be closed.

At a later time I shall ask permission to insert as a part of these remarks a very strong editorial written by a powerful Democratic newspaper in Lowell, the Lowell Sun. It speaks of the fact that there is great resentment, great bitterness of feeling, and great fear for the future on the part of all of the people of Lowell because of the Czechoslovakia treaty and the proposed treaty with Great Britain. The present is bad enough; the future may be infinitely worse.

Mr. Chairman, in appearing before the committee for reciprocity information I submitted petitions signed by 6,800 workers of the city of Lowell. It is one of the largest petitions presented to the committee for reciprocity information. The first real mill started in this country, in all of the United States, was started in our city of Lowell, Mass., where we have the finest so-called labor market in all the country; in fact, in all the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of March 16, 1938]

AGAIN THE SACRIFICIAL CALF

"Massachusetts has everything to lose and nothing to gain in the proposed (tariff) treaty with the United Kingdom. Massachusetts is being placed on the sacrificial altar in the hope of bettering conditions in other parts of the country."

That is the way that Representative TREADWAY sums up the proposed trade agreement with England which would permit English cotton mills to flood the American market, and thus ruin the cotton-textile industry in New England, particularly in Lowell. And Representative TREADWAY has hit the nail on the head.

Only last week we saw trade treaty maker, Secretary of State Hull, from southern Tennessee, blow the shoe industry out of New England by signing a trade agreement with Czechoslovakia. Now low-priced Czech shoes made by cheap labor are permitted to flood the American market and do one of these two things: (1) Either drive the shoe industry out of business or (2) cause the workers in shoe manufacturing to accept wages far below what they are now getting, and the wages they are now getting are hardly a living wage; failure to reduce wages will mean that the New England shoe manufacturer will be unable to meet Czech prices and therefore must go out of business. That isn't a very pretty picture.

Now Mr. Hull, who can do nothing without the approval of President Roosevelt, is ready to do the same job on our textile industry. What will be left of Lowell after these two staggering blows?

New England labor and industry are united on this issue, but what good it will do is a question. For industry it means no business; for labor it means no wages.

When confronted by a united New England front, Hull said that there were always some who would subordinate the welfare of the country to that of themselves. In other words, Hull tells us that we in New England should be willing to offer ourselves as a sacrifice so that the remainder of the Nation may prosper.

Why doesn't Hull and the rest of the administration in Washington suggest that some other part of the Nation do the sacrificing for a change, so that New England might prosper?

We have said time and again, and repeat it now, that the New Deal has never given New England the consideration it has shown for the West and the South. It spent 10 times more relief money in those sections than it did in New England. It gave cotton growers in the South and farmers in the West money for not growing anything on their land—and the money it was giving them was collected in taxes from New England and the other industrial States of the East.

It has always catered to the West and the South because the balance of voting power was there. When President Roosevelt proposed the wage and hour bill no newspaper gave him stronger and more sincere support than this one. We did so because we thought that a wage and hour bill would make southern cotton manufacturers pay the same wage as northern cotton manufacturers do. And that would mean more work for men in our cotton mills because they are better workers, and on an equal-wage basis New England manufacturers could more than compete with those in the South.

But what happened when the bill came before Congress? Southern Members turned the heat on the President, and he backed down by assuring them that any wage and hour bill would call for lower wages in the South than in the North. The bill didn't pass in Congress, but it wouldn't have helped any if it had—that is, if it had in its remade form.

Now we have the shoe treaty with Czechoslovakia which is likely to end the shoe industry in New England, and if it doesn't ruin it it is sure to badly cripple it.

And it looks as though Hull is going to put the final nail in our coffin by signing the cotton textile trade treaty with England. Then what few cotton mills we have left will either go out of business or operate on a greatly reduced scale.

Hull says that in these days of grave war danger the United States can best help to prevent war by these friendly trade treaties with foreign powers. When it means throwing thousands and thousands of our New England people out of work, we say Mr. Hull has a warped opinion of what we must do to pull other people's war chestnuts out of the fire.

Why should the people of New England be persecuted like this? What have they done to be the continual targets of the administration in Washington? Here we are in another depression, and the administration, instead of helping our people to find work, deliberately promotes plans which are going to throw those who still have jobs out of work.

We only hope that something can be done to end this madness.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to be called upon so often to reply to remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]. She expresses great fear, and says that the workers in the leather business in Massachusetts and the makers of shoes express great fear in respect to their jobs. My understanding is that it is a proven fact that under the arrangement made by the Secretary of State and this Government with the Government of Czechoslovakia, with reference to shoes and the importation of shoes into this country, at the maximum, all of the shoes that could possibly be shipped into the country under the arrangement would amount to not more than one-half of 1 percent of all of the shoes that are manufactured and sold in this country. For that very small concession to Czechoslovakia, we, in many products that are produced in this country, of which we produce a surplus, receive valuable assurances of exportation to that country of these products of American labor, and it does appear to me that if in consideration of many thousands of dollars, probably running into the millions, we may export to countries like Czechoslovakia, and give in exchange the right of importation into this country of only one-half of 1 percent, or less, of the shoes made in this country, we have made a pretty good trade for the workers of the United States. Furthermore, everyone knows that since the World War the doctrine of infant industries, so much talked about by our friends in tariff discussions for many years and used as their main argument, has ceased to exist, and that our factories are not only not infant industries any more but are the greatest in all the world.

Unless the factories of this country, producing this surplus, can by some kind of an arrangement, send that surplus to other countries of the earth, what will become of these expanded factories, and what will become of the American workers that are employed in those factories? Let me repeat what I said on this floor some days ago, in my opinion, one of the great contributing causes, among others, of the debacle of 1929 was the fact that we had reared tariff walls in this country so high that we practically closed ourselves to the commerce of the world and when we reared these tariff walls to the point where they became prohibitive, it is axiomatic that that practically closed the ports of the world to the commerce of America, because, as has been said so many times, money does not cross the ocean to balance the difference in trade of one country against another. It is the surplus products shipped from one country to another that balance the trade.

Let me repeat what I said here a few days ago. McKinley had been chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and wrote the McKinley tariff bill. Afterward he was President of the United States, and is one of the patron saints of the Republican Party. McKinley made the statement during the consideration of the McKinley Tariff Act that this country could not hope to continue to sell where it did not buy. Modern Republican tariff writers forget that. They brought us to the point where somebody like

the Secretary of State and the present President in the United States in some way had to break down these barriers that had become insurmountable. We had been trading with countries that for years were practically free-trade countries but we kept raising our tariffs to the point where finally we taught them how to write tariffs, and when they did they levied them with a vengeance. They now have tariffs that in many instances are the equal of ours and in some instances higher. The time has come when, if we are to continue trading with these countries we have got to sit around the table and come to an understanding.

So, let me close as I began, by saying that if we are making a bargain with a country like Czechoslovakia to take a few of their products in order that we may sell many of ours and thus keep American workers employed, I think it is a great compliment to those who did it, and a great service to the people of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would remind the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the majority floor leader, for whom I have a very high regard, that President McKinley's wish and statement was for reciprocity. He wanted to import the commodities that we did not make, commodities that would not force our mills to close. He wanted trade. But he did not wish to shut out some of our industries from being able to continue. He did not want to throw our workers out of work. He did not want to sacrifice the worker in industry for the farmer. We all want trade with foreign countries, but not at the expense of our own.

I also would like to remind the distinguished majority floor leader that the wool growers of Texas and the States of the West are just as anxious, just as much afraid that their tariff on raw wool will be cut when the reciprocal-trade agreement is made with Australia. I believe the present Chairman of the Committee of the Whole is just as anxious that this duty be not cut. It would seem to make a difference from what section of the country one comes. I am sure the gentleman really wants protection for his own section of the country.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield at that point?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I hope the gentleman will let me continue. I did not interrupt him. I will gladly yield later.

I refer the gentleman to the questions answered by Mr. Fox, who was then sitting as a member of the Board for Reciprocity Information, in the Department of Commerce auditorium. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LORD] asked Mr. Fox what the percentage of importation from Czechoslovakia now was under the reciprocal-trade agreement with that country in types of shoes that compete with the women's shoes now made in my own district, made in Massachusetts, made in the Middle West, and made in New York. Mr. Fox replied that the quota of importations would be increased from 1 to 1½ percent of our shoe production. At the present time the percentage is 1 percent of our total production of shoes, but that 1 percent is highly concentrated competition.

I refer the gentleman to a statement I am going to put in the Record on Monday. This statement will show the terms of the reciprocal-trade agreement with Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Chairman, we asked for protection on cemented shoes but were granted instead less protection than we now have. At one time, Mr. Chairman, the Tariff Commission raised the duty on McKay shoes, but under this reciprocal-trade agreement the duty on McKay shoes was lowered 50 percent. The distressing part of it, Mr. Chairman, is that these duties are frozen into law for a definite period. There can be no increases of duty as conditions arise. Importations have increased alarmingly during this year. Our workers, therefore, will have no redress.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Members of this House fully realize the actual terror that has seized workers in many of our industries, the fear of losing their jobs? I am

not exaggerating. I have in my hand an editorial published in a Democratic paper that does not wish to attack the Democratic administration, I am sure, but that editorial shows the paper is thoroughly indignant at the treatment of our industries. When you read this editorial, if later I am granted permission to include it in my remarks, you will realize the plight of these people. I wish you could go into my own State of Massachusetts, go into New England, or go into Providence, R. I.; go into the different towns, if you will, the communities where the mills happen to be making airplane cloth for our own airplanes, a product that is very much needed for national defense.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a letter from the Navy Department showing how important this airplane fabric is. The letter was read to the Committee for Reciprocity Information by Mr. H. M. Bingham as part of his testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regrets to advise the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that under the rules consent to include extraneous matter must be obtained in the House; it cannot be granted by the Committee of the Whole.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will make the request when we go back into the House. These mills will be affected adversely by the treaty with the United Kingdom. This letter shows the importance the Navy Department and the War Department attach to these mills and how necessary they feel it is that these mills be allowed to continue their commerce in order that they may be available to make this cloth. The letter is as follows:

COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION—DIVISION IV

Statement of H. M. Brigham, Wellington Sears Co., 65 Worth Street, New York City, who was duly sworn, and testified as follows:

Mr. BRIGHAM. I was scheduled to appear tomorrow under airplane cloths, airplane fabrics, and I am speaking in behalf of the Lonsdale Co., William Whitman Co., the Suncook Mills, Ponemah Mills, and the Warwick Mills, and it was under those names that our written brief was filed.

The significant feature of our brief may be stated simply by saying that if this group of mills loses their regular commercial business because of foreign competition that our Army and Navy Air Corps will lose their domestic sources of supply for their aircraft fabrics. These aircraft fabrics supplement in a very small way our regular commercial production, and without our regular production there is not sufficient yardage in these aircraft fabrics to warrant the operation of one mill. To verify our claim that this group constitutes the sole sources of supply for aircraft fabrics, I will read a copy of a letter from the Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department, to the Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Navy Department. The subject of this letter is, Source of Supply for Aircraft Fabrics, with four references. Reference (a) is the copy of our written brief to the Secretary of the Navy; reference (b) is our original brief to this committee; and references (c) and (d) are specific contracts that the Navy Department had with suppliers outside the group which I am representing.

The letter reads as follows:

"The statements of the basic letter" (which is our written brief) "so far as they concern the special nature of the fabrics involved and the availability of sources of supply are believed to be correct. This belief may readily and conclusively be substantiated by a review of past Navy Department procurements covering airplane and balloon cloth.

"(a) Sources of supply: Over a period of years bids have been received from the same few mills, despite all attempts to encourage wider competition. Several years ago an officer in the supply department of the Naval Aircraft Factory endeavored by correspondence and by personal contact to interest other mills and to urge them to initiate manufacture of airplane cloth, but all efforts were unproductive of results.

"(b) Special and exacting nature of aircraft fabrics: Because of the use to which these fabrics are put and the severe service to which they are subjected they demand almost perfection in manufacture. Slight defects which ordinarily would be acceptable in other fabrics cannot be permitted, particularly where the fabric is to be coated for the retention of gases. The strength-weight ratio is unusually high when compared with ordinary commercial fabrics, and mills must exercise extreme care in the selection of cotton and in manufacture to produce cloths having the physical properties specified.

"(c) Manufacture: Endeavors of the Bureau to develop new sources of supply have been attended by delays and in most cases failure to deliver satisfactory material. Under reference (c) the contractor delivered material which apparently met the specifications in that it was accepted by the field inspection service. However, the cloth could not be used by overhaul activities when it was issued, and the entire lot was salvaged and employed for fabrication of tow targets and other purposes where a much less expensive cloth such as sheeting or muslin had previously been used. Under reference (d) the contractor attempted for almost

a year beyond his delivery date to make an acceptable sample, and finally defaulted on the contract and purchase was made against his account." Reference (c) is one of the first contractors, Navy contract 9125, Batavia Mills. Reference (d) is Navy contract 42089, Robert Bracewell, contractor.

"A review of the above leads to the conclusion that the present sources of supply are all that can definitely be depended upon, and that any increased requirements in an emergency will in all probability be taken care of by an expansion of existing sources rather than by a development of new sources. In the event that new manufacturers do enter this field, it is not believed that immediate deliveries in any quantities need be expected.

"No comment can be made in connection with the possible influence of a reduction in tariff by a reciprocal-trade agreement upon the present domestic production of fine fabrics. Two of the factors which affect cloth prices are materials and labor. There will not be a great differential between the cost of raw cotton in this country and in Great Britain. The big advantage which this country would have must then be the result of a reduction in the number of operations caused by improvements in equipment. However, full automatic machinery has not been developed for fine goods to the same extent as for coarser fabrics, and the labor advantage to manufacturers of this country would be negligible. In the event that foreign competition brought about by a tariff reduction would cause cessation of manufacture in this country, this Bureau believes that the opinion expressed is correct that adequate supplies in an emergency would be difficult to obtain. This Bureau is in no position to predict the consequence of a reciprocal-trade agreement upon the industry, but does recommend that the influence of such action upon military supplies be given consideration prior to adoption. It is desired to reiterate and emphasize the previously expressed opinion that any action which will tend at this time to decrease the availability of domestic stocks of aircraft fabrics or to cause withdrawal of existing facilities will work to the disadvantage of national defense in future emergencies when the requirements for such materials will be greatly increased and immediate deliveries mandatory."

Whereas this letter is in a sense unofficial and merely an interdepartmental communication, it does nevertheless confirm our statement that we are sole sources of supply for these aircraft fabrics.

The official attitude of the Navy may be determined from a letter of March 5 signed by the Honorable Claude Swanson, which reads as follows:

"Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of January 28, 1938, enclosing a copy of a letter addressed to Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, on the subject of the negotiation of a trade agreement with the United Kingdom and its effect on supplies of aircraft fabrics.

"Your statements so far as they concern the special nature of the fabrics involved and available sources of supply are believed to be correct. With regard to the possible influence of the reduction in tariff by a reciprocal-trade agreement upon the present domestic production of fine fabrics, the two factors which affect cloth prices are materials and labor. It is assumed that these factors will receive their due consideration by the State Department in the formulation of a reciprocal-trade agreement."

I have been unable to get similar copies of correspondence from the War Department, but I have seen some of this correspondence and assure you that the War Department substantiates what the Navy has said. If there is any doubt in your minds concerning the position of the War Department, I respectfully suggest that you secure a copy of a letter dated January 27, written by the Air Corps, Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, to the Chief of the Air Corps in Washington. As a matter of fact, whereas there are five mills subscribing to this brief, this Air Corps letter just referred to admits of only four sources of supply.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I heard some testimony the other day at the Raleigh Hotel when the textile manufacturers were presenting their case. This is a vital matter to our national defense. I may say there are no textile mills in my particular district which make that kind of cloth, but I am thinking also of the mills all over the country. Mills in the South also will be hurt by this treaty with the United Kingdom.

Let us consider for a moment the corduroy mills, and I have three of them in my district, although one is closed today. On account of the large importation of corduroy and velveteen from Japan it is the concentrated competition from which these mills are suffering.

May I say also that it is the concentrated competition in connection with the importation of shoes that also makes it so harmful to certain types of shoes made by American workers. Competition so far as men's shoes are concerned is not great, but there is a tremendously concentrated competition in women's shoes. The leather workers are affected as the type of leather used in these shoes is like the leather made by our own leather workers. This is also true in con-

nection with corduroy, which comes in from Japan. Under the favored nation clause, Mr. Chairman, Japan will have the same advantages that are given to Great Britain; in fact every country of the world will have that same advantage except Germany.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to bring up another point. While these hearings are going on, in other words, while our workers and manufacturers are testifying, negotiators and trade representatives from Great Britain and the United Kingdom who are here to negotiate a treaty are allowed to listen in and take notes. They are permitted to hear the whole story. They know our case. Yet when these discussions are had over there, our manufacturers and our workers are not allowed to sit in and hear their testimony. May I request the Members of the House to join me in asking that our manufacturers, our chambers of commerce, and our labor leaders be permitted to sit in when the British present their case. I believe we should have every fact possible in order to fight our battle. It is a very real thing. It should be nonpartisan and nonpolitical. It is a fight to save our workers from financial destruction, a fight to maintain our standard of living and of wages.

Mr. Chairman, when the Republicans were in power when I thought measures were detrimental to my district and to the country as a whole or to my section of the country I fought them just as hard as I am fighting this matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would not have requested this additional time had it not been that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts referred to the wool growers of my State. May I say that their representatives were in Washington and came to my office? I made an engagement for them to see Secretary Hull to talk about a trade arrangement with reference to wool. When that conference was over, one of the leaders came back to my office and told me that Secretary Hull was right. He also informed me further that they had agreed with Mr. Hull.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY].

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I heard part of the statement made by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and I deplore just as much as she does competition which will in any way imperil our industries in Massachusetts and New England. It is true that a treaty has been negotiated with Czechoslovakia. I understand the total volume of shoes that will come in under that agreement amounts to about 1¼ percent of all the shoes manufactured for the American market. However, I think even that 1¼ percent, due to the fact labor is so cheap in Czechoslovakia, might have the effect of depressing the price of some of the American-made shoes.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is another and more serious side to this question which I think the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] has neglected to consider, as well as some others of my colleagues. I refer to competition from the low-wage areas of our own country. The maximum competition for the boot and shoe industry is 1¼ percent from Czechoslovakia, but from other sections of this country, and I refer to the low-wage areas, we face an additional and greater competition. It is a fact that the boot and shoe industry has migrated from Massachusetts into the State of Maine, the State of Missouri, and other States where the wage levels and the working standards were less stringent than in Massachusetts.

That is the competition which has been damaging the industries of Massachusetts far more than the trade treaties. This situation has been going on for some 15 years. This migration of the textile industries and the boot and shoe industry from New England and Massachusetts started long before reciprocal-trade treaties were ever thought of. This migration has been going on into the cheaper wage areas of this country. Much of the capital that was formerly

invested in those industries in Massachusetts and New England has gone into the cheaper wage areas of this country because there they have the opportunity to exploit labor and do not have to observe the labor standards that obtain in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

During the time the Republicans were in power this migration of industry from Massachusetts was at its height. So far as I know, nothing was ever proposed by the party then in power to halt this migration, to halt this exodus of industry from that State.

During this very Congress a bill—the wage and hour bill—which would tend to in some measure equalize labor conditions throughout the country and result in maintaining a parity as far as minimum wages and maximum hours are concerned in all sections of the Nation, was defeated.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I am sorry I cannot yield in the few minutes allotted to me.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman mentioned my name.

Mr. HEALEY. I did not mention the gentlewoman's name particularly. I also referred to all my colleagues who voted against this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reiterate this bill would have remedied labor conditions all over the country.

From 1926 to 1936, most of which time the Republicans were in control, we lost 350,000 jobs from our pay rolls in the textile and the boot and shoe industries of Massachusetts. Certainly, this was not because of any trade treaties with Czechoslovakia or any other nation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, may I remind the gentleman that it was under a Republican administration the child-labor amendment was passed and went to the States for ratification. House Joint Resolution 184 was introduced on February 13, 1924, by Representative Israel M. Foster, of Ohio, Republican. It passed the House on April 26, 1924; passed the Senate on June 2, 1924, and was enacted June 4, 1924 under President Coolidge. May I also remind the gentleman from Massachusetts that when the Republican Party was in power in Massachusetts it was responsible for the first and very splendid labor laws, the first such laws to be enacted in the United States, and the first to be enforced and carried on to the present time.

I know the gentleman and all the Members from Massachusetts are extremely anxious to have uniform hours of labor and high wages, but, Mr. Chairman, you and I know the wages paid in other sections of the country, no matter how low they may be, do not compare with the low wages paid in Japan, in Czechoslovakia, or in England. If the low-priced goods pour into this country it will make even more difficult the passage of a good wage and hour law.

Mr. Chairman, I did not speak of the woolen industry that is so menaced by the proposed treaty with the United Kingdom. This industry recently has been having a very difficult time, as are many others in this depression. They realize lowered duty on woolen cloth from England will close more mills.

I took up with the President, the Secretary of State, and the Committee for Reciprocity Information the matter of the proposed reciprocal-trade agreement with Australia, which is contemplated, and asked that it be negotiated and go into effect at the same time as the treaty with the United Kingdom, in order that the woolen manufacturers, as well as the wool growers, may know what the price of wool is likely to be. The woolen industry is, unfortunately, a highly speculative industry, anyway. No woolen manufacturer is going to buy his wool until he knows what will happen to the wool coming in from Australia, nor can he afford to do so. That would work a hardship on the workers and

on the wool growers also. I have talked with various wool growers and with Members of Congress who have wool growers in their districts, and they agree with me it is vitally important for them to know what will happen to the price of raw wool coming in from Australia. It is said that two-thirds of our imports of wool come from Australia.

I earnestly hope, Mr. Chairman, the Members of the House will join with me and with the Democrats, because there are Democrats like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN], Senator DUFFY, of Wisconsin, and others, who are fighting against having the duty lowered on certain items and against having low prices frozen in our country year after year. They are fighting with us in order that our people may keep their jobs and be given more jobs in order that our people may maintain their standard of living and wages.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read down to and including line 6 on page 1.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9995) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend as a part of my own remarks made in Committee a few minutes ago and include therein an editorial in the Lowell Sun regarding the reciprocal-trade agreement with the United Kingdom; also a letter from the Navy Department regarding the great importance of having airplane cloth made in this country and of keeping open the mills providing such cloth. This letter was incorporated in a statement read by H. M. Bingham to the Committee for Reciprocity Information, which was hearing testimony on textiles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HANCOCK of New York asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the controversy on the floor this afternoon during the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]—and I am sorry the gentleman is not here—I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD with reference to the gentleman's attitude on the Tennessee Valley Authority, and to include therein a resolution introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] on June 11, 1934, calling for an investigation of the T. V. A. I may say that at that time Mr. Arthur E. Morgan was a member of the board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The resolution is as follows:

House Resolution 429

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority was created by an act of Congress approved May 18, 1933, to improve the navigability and to provide for the flood control of the Tennessee River; to provide

for reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands in the Tennessee Valley, and for other purposes; and

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority has ignored the main purposes of the act and is treating the intent of the Congress and the letter and spirit of the law as of secondary importance; and

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority is spending vast sums of money from the Treasury of the United States in sociological investigation and research and for the "planned social and economic development" of the Tennessee Valley, which was never contemplated by the Congress; and

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority has entered into direct competition with private enterprise and is actually engaged in a merchandising business to the prejudice and disadvantage of local tradesmen and investors; and

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority proposes to establish cooperatives and cooperative stores with the ultimate objective of controlling the industrial and agricultural activities of the Tennessee Valley; and

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority has employed a host of high-salaried alleged experts, technicians, consultants, social workers, and publicity agents who, together with their staffs, fill three large office buildings; and

Whereas it was originally stated by the Tennessee Valley Authority that the personnel to be employed would be taken from the Tennessee Valley, it has proceeded to fill practically every position of importance with people from other parts of the country who are socialistically inclined; and

Whereas notwithstanding the expressed terms of the act, directing the Tennessee Valley Authority to improve and cheapen the production of fertilizer for the farmers, nothing has been done to utilize existing facilities or to provide other plants; and

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority has shown an utter disregard of property rights and of the rights of private power companies and their stockholders by forcing them into agreements that amount to virtual confiscation; and

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority, without any authority of law, has squandered huge sums of Federal money in the acquisition of a town site, located 3 miles from the Norris Dam, which its publicity experts advertise as a model city but which will have no practical value or useful purpose after the completion of the dam; and

Whereas numerous complaints have been made by property owners, taxpayers, businessmen, and farmers in the vicinity, protesting against the unfair and un-American treatment and competition by the Tennessee Valley Authority and its agents through use of Government funds and subsidies; and

Whereas it is rapidly becoming apparent that the Tennessee Valley Authority is engaged in trying to destroy private industry, to eliminate the profit system, to place industry in a strait jacket, to regiment the farmers, to control business and agricultural activities in the Tennessee Valley, and to establish a socialistic form of collectivism and Government ownership: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint a committee of five Members of the House, not more than three of whom shall be from the same political party, to conduct a thorough investigation of the activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority and its agents and subsidiaries, and the committee shall report the results of its investigations with recommendations at the convening of the next Congress, or as soon thereafter as practicable.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and following the legislative program of the day, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is it expected we will complete the consideration of the Military Establishment appropriation bill by Tuesday?

Mr. RAYBURN. Not later than Tuesday. I may say, Mr. Speaker, in further answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts, we expect to complete the consideration of this bill on Monday and Tuesday, and on Wednesday call the calendar of committees. I presume the Speaker will recognize the chairman of the Committee on Rules to take up the resolution on the T. V. A. investigation when that is reported. It is hoped to begin the consideration of the legislative appropriation bill on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken in general debate on the Military Establishment appropriation bill may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. HARLAN, may be permitted to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the short bill to which he referred in his remarks today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939

Mr. STARNES (for Mr. COLLINS) submitted a conference report and statement to accompany the bill (H. R. 9181) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KRAMER for 10 days on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 28, 1938, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The Committee on Banking and Currency will continue hearings on Monday, March 28, 1938, at 10:30 a. m., on the Patman bill, H. R. 7230.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

On Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, March 28, 29, and 30, 1938, at 10 a. m., the Committee on Patents will continue hearings that began Monday, March 21, 1938, on the following measures: H. R. 9259, to provide for compulsory licensing of patents; H. R. 9815, to provide for the granting of licenses under patents brought within a single control by competitors to dominate an industry; H. R. 1666, to provide counsel for the defense and prosecution of rights of indigent patentees.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 29, 1938. Business to be considered: Continuation of hearings on H. R. 9738—civil aeronautics.

There will be a meeting of Mr. MALONEY's subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 5, 1938. Business to be considered: Continuation of hearing on S. 1261—through routes.

There will be a meeting of Mr. BULWINKLE's subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 5, 1938. Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 9073—to extend services of the Cape Fear River.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 12, 1938. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 9047—control of venereal diseases, and other kindred bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Subcommittee on Judiciary of the Committee on the District of Columbia will meet Monday, March 28, 1938, at 10:30 a. m., in room 345 House Office Building, to consider the following bills: H. R. 9684—Racing Board; H. R. 9759—penalty for assault with dangerous weapon.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a hearing before subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads at 10 a. m. Wednesday, April 6, 1938, on bills in behalf of custodial employees in the Postal Service. Room 213, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in room 445, House Office Building, at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, March 30, 1938, for the public consideration of H. R. 8631—for the relief of Vincenzo Ferrero, and for the further consideration of unfinished business of the committee.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee will hold hearings at 10 a. m., in room 219, House Office Building, on the following bills on the dates indicated:

Tuesday, March 29, 1938:

H. R. 9765—S. 3595. To authorize the purchase and distribution of products of the fishing industry.

Wednesday, March 30, 1938:

H. R. 8840. To amend section 6 of the act approved May 27, 1936 (49 Stat. L. 1380).

S. 1273. To adopt regulations for preventing collisions at sea.

Tuesday, April 5, 1938:

S. 2580. To amend existing laws so as to promote safety at sea by requiring the proper design, construction, maintenance, inspection, and operation of ships; to give effect to the Convention for Promoting Safety of Life at Sea, 1929; and for other purposes.

Tuesday, April 12, 1938:

H. R. 6797. To provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of one or more fish-cultural stations in each of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

H. R. 8956. To provide for the conservation of the fishery resources of the Columbia River; establishment, operation, and maintenance of one or more stations in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho; and for the conduct of necessary investigations, surveys, stream improvements, and stocking operations for these purposes.

S. 2307. To provide for the conservation of the fishery resources of the Columbia River; establishment, operation, and maintenance of one or more stations in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho; and for the conduct of necessary investigations, surveys, stream improvements, and stocking operations for these purposes.

Thursday, April 14, 1938:

H. R. 8533. To amend section 4370 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 46, sec. 316).

Tuesday, April 19, 1938:

H. R. 5629. To exempt motorboats less than 21 feet in length not carrying passengers for hire from the act of June 9, 1910, regulating the equipment of motorboats.

H. R. 7089. To require examinations for issuance of motorboat operators' license.

H. R. 8839. To amend laws for preventing collisions of vessels, to regulate equipment of motorboats on the navigable waters of the United States, to regulate inspection and manning of certain motorboats which are not used exclusively for pleasure and those which are not engaged exclusively in the fisheries on inland waters of the United States, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Full open committee, Naval Affairs, meets at 10:30 a. m. Monday, April 4, 1938; continuation of consideration of H. R. 9315—to regulate the distribution, promotion, and retirement of officers on the line of the Navy, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1183. A letter from the chief scout executive of the Boy Scouts of America, transmitting a copy of the Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the Boy Scouts of America (H. Doc. No. 562); to the Committee on Education and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1184. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 16, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Woonasquatucket River and tributaries, Rhode Island, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1185. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 16, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Hudson Creek, Pasco County, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1186. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 15, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Moshassuck River and tributaries, Rhode Island, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1187. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 16, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Crow River, Minn., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 9227. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize boxing in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; with amendment (Rept. No. 2004). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 711. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, and particularly sections 863, 911, and 914 of the said code; with amendment (Rept. No. 2005). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SIROVICH: Committee on Patents. House Joint Resolution 447. Joint resolution to protect the copyrights and patents of foreign exhibitors at the Pacific Mercade International Exposition, to be held at Los Angeles, Calif., in 1940; with amendment (Rept. No. 2006). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Patents. S. 477. An act to prevent fraud, deception, or other improper practice in connection with business before the United States Patent Office, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2007). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Patents. H. R. 9996. A bill to authorize the registration of certain collective trademarks; with amendment (Rept. No. 2008). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WALLGREN: A bill (H. R. 10024) to establish the Olympic National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. IZAC: A bill (H. R. 10025) to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Santa Marguerita River and its tributaries in the State of California for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 10026) to authorize co-operation between the United States and the State of New York in the protection of the public interest and welfare inherent in certain forest lands in said State through provision for the acquisition and management of said lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: A bill (H. R. 10027) to provide for the regional conservation and development of the national resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PALMISANO (by request): A bill (H. R. 10028) to provide for insurance rates against loss by fire and lightning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SIROVICH: A bill (H. R. 10029) providing for a surgeon and ship hospital on vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10030) relative to limitation of ship-owners' liability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 10031) to authorize the acquisition of lands in the vicinity of Jacksonville, Fla., as a site for a naval air station and to authorize the construction and installation of a naval air station thereon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10032) to provide for the establishment of a navy yard at Jacksonville, Fla., to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 10033) to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Deer Creek and the watersheds thereof in the county of Tehama, in the State of California, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 10034) to make Members and former Members of Congress ineligible for appointment to certain offices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 631) to provide for the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FORD of California: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 632) providing for the participation of the United States in the international trade exposition to be known as Pacific Mercado, to be held in the city of Los Angeles, Calif., commencing in the year 1940, and in the world's fair to be held in connection therewith in the year 1942, commemorating the landing of Cabrillo, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLINS: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 45) providing for an investigation of the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the tariff on tungsten and tungsten products; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 10035) to amend the act approved June 13, 1934, conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, consider, and render judgment on certain claims of George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLAHERTY: A bill (H. R. 10036) for the relief of Albert Mathieson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GREGORY: A bill (H. R. 10037) granting a pension to Mary Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARTER: A bill (H. R. 10038) to provide for the appointment of Cloran D. Riggle, Akron, Ohio, as a captain, Judge Advocate General's Department, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: A bill (H. R. 10039) granting a pension to Emma Sears Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANZETTA: A bill (H. R. 10040) to authorize the presentation of a Distinguished Service Cross to Quintin Serrano; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAVERICK: A bill (H. R. 10041) for the relief of Virgil Kuehl, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10042) for the relief of William G. Schmid; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 10043) for the relief of certain carpenters whose tools were destroyed by fire while stored in a Works Progress Administration warehouse in Jersey City, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHULTE: A bill (H. R. 10044) for the relief of John A. Barr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 10045) granting an increase of pension to Maria A. Chandler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 10046) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Fairfax Ayres; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4633. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Resolution of the Salmon Purse Seiners' Union No. 3, of Everett, Wash., N. E. Mason, secretary, urging the passage of House bill 4199, the General Welfare Act, and also the passage of Congressman O'CONNELL's House Joint Resolution 527, the peace bill, providing for distinction between the aggressor and victim and forbidding exportation of war materials to the aggressor; protesting against the passage of the Hill-Sheppard bill (May bill), and protesting against the undemocratic conduct of a number of Senators in filibustering against the antilynching bill, thereby sabotaging democracy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4634. Also, resolution of the Salmon Purse Seiners' Union, No. 3, of Everett, Wash., N. E. Mason, secretary, urging passage of the Coffee fine arts bill (H. R. 9102), proposing the establishment of a permanent Bureau of Fine Arts and a suitable machinery for its administration throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Education.

4635. By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of the Finished Laundry, Inc., Bronx, New York City, opposing the tax of 1 cent on fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4636. Also, petition of the New York County Lawyers' Association, New York City, N. Y., opposing Senate Joint Resolution 134, which seeks to amend the Constitution in relation to the procedure of proposing and ratifying amendments to the Constitution by providing for the adoption of constitutional amendments by popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4637. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of Hon. C. G. Haley, Centerville, Tex., favoring amendment of the

Wagner-Peyser Act, in order for the United States Employment Service to be in a position to request adequate appropriations to enable it to supervise State employment offices, and to operate the Veterans' Placement Service and the Farm Placement Service; to the Committee on Labor.

4638. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Independent Theatre Owners Association, New York City, concerning the Neely-Pettengill bill (S. 153); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4639. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, concerning Federal Government reorganization; to the Committee on Government Organization.

4640. Also, petition of P. Pastene & Co., Inc., New York City, concerning the Federal reorganization legislation; to the Committee on Government Organization.

4641. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of Charles E. Reed president, Columbus Safety Division of F. C. U., 16 engine house, Columbus, Ohio, urging the defeat of House bill 7265, providing for the transfer of all supervision and examination of credit unions in the District of Columbia to the Farm Credit Administration; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4642. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of P. Pastene & Co., Inc., New York City, concerning the Government reorganization bill; to the Committee on Government Organization.

4643. Also, petition of the Educators Association, Inc., New York City, concerning the Government reorganization bill; to the Committee on Government Organization.

4644. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, New York City, concerning the Federal Government reorganization bill; to the Committee on Government Organization.

4645. Also, petition of the Independent Theater Owners Association, Inc., New York City, concerning the Neely-Pettengill bill (S. 153); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4646. By the SPEAKER: Petition pledging the support of the Eastern Pennsylvania Student Peace Conference to a program which will make the United States a genuine and active force for peace; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4647. Also, petition from the American Library Association, endorsing the report of the Advisory Committee on Education; to the Committee on Education.

4648. Also, petition from the city of Lansing, Mich., protesting against any amendment to the Works Progress Administration appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4649. Also, petition from the Lithuanians of New Jersey, protesting against the enslaving of Lithuanians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4650. By Mr. HART: Petition of the One Hundred and Sixty-second Legislature of the State of New Jersey, House of Assembly, Trenton, N. J., favoring reduction of the interest rate on mortgages held by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation from 5 percent to 3 or 3½ percent and to extend the amortization period for said mortgages from 15 years to 20 or 25 years; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4651. Also, petition of Lithuanian citizens of the State of New Jersey, concerning the recent international events, especially the Polish-Lithuanian developments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 28, 1938

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 5, 1938)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, March 25, 1938, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, it is apparent that there is an absence of a quorum. I suggest such absence, and ask that the roll be called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	Hughes	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Copeland	Johnson, Calif.	Overton
Ashurst	Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Pittman
Austin	Dieterich	King	Pope
Bailey	Donahey	La Follette	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Duffy	Lee	Reames
Barkley	Ellender	Lewis	Reynolds
Berry	Frazier	Lodge	Russell
Bilbo	George	Logan	Schwartz
Bone	Gerry	Loneragan	Schwellenbach
Borah	Gibson	Lundeen	Sheppard
Bridges	Gillette	McAdoo	Shipstead
Brown, Mich.	Glass	McGill	Smathers
Brown, N. H.	Green	McKellar	Smith
Bulkeley	Guffey	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Hale	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Harrison	Miller	Townsend
Byrd	Hatch	Milton	Truman
Byrnes	Hayden	Minton	Tydings
Capper	Herring	Murray	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hill	Neely	Wagner
Chavez	Hitchcock	Norris	Walsh
Clark	Holt	Nye	Wheeler

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are detained from the Senate on important public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is detained in his State on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 21, 1938:

S. 1077. An act to amend the act creating the Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes.

On March 26, 1938:

S. 975. An act to amend the act approved February 7, 1913, so as to remove restrictions as to the use of the Little Rock Confederate Cemetery, and for other purposes;

S. 1986. An act to amend section 42 of title 7 of the Canal Zone Code and section 41 of the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 48, sec. 893);

S. 2963. An act authorizing the Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., to accept gifts and bequests of money for the purpose of erecting a building on land now owned by the United States Government at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes;

S. 3554. An act authorizing the appointment of an additional judge of the District Court for the Northern District of Alabama; and

S. 3655. An act amending section 312 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES IN FOURTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PRIVATE AIR LAW

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State to the end that legislation may be enacted authorizing an appropriation of the sum of \$15,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the expenses of participation by the United